This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE UNIVERSITY MILITANT

BY CHARLES FERGUSON

378
S92

LELAND·STANFORD·JVNIOR·VNIVERSITY

The University Militant

The University Militant

by

CHARLES FERGUSON

STANFORD LIBRARY

MITCHELL KENNERLEY
NEW YORK AND LONDON
MCMXI

COPYRIGHT, 1911, BY
MITCHELL KENNERLEY

165380

STANFORD LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, CAMBRIDGE, U. S. A.

Contents

	Page
Preface	7
Introductory	9
The New Political Economy	20
What is Government for	27
What is the Mission of the Church	38
What is a School	51
The Institutional Principle	64
The Three Great Visions of the Old World	68
The Rise of the New Creative Order	78
The Rise of Free Cities under the New Order	90
National University Towns	98
The Spiritual Integration of the New Industrial Order	116
The Communism of the Intellect	125
The University — Mistress of the Market	133

	Page
SUMMARY	142
ADDENDA	
Publisher's Note	150
For the Whole of Kansas City — East and West	150
The Newsbook	152
The Municipal University	162
For a University Quadrangle	172
Notes	174
The Work of a Citizens' Lobby	181

PREFACE

THIS book is addressed to those who understand that great changes are taking place in the order of the world; that religion, politics, education, business cannot possibly be the same, day after to-morrow that they are to-day; that decrepit institutions are swiftly passing away, and new ones, with fresh vigor and portent, are lifting their promises into the light.

In particular it offers itself to those who are escaping from the ruins of the old religious and political superstitions, without leaving either their faith or their prudence behind them; those who are disposed to build for themselves, while there is yet time, a new intellectual and spiritual establishment that shall be strong enough to withstand both the seductions of the money-power and the assaults of the mob.

This manifesto of the University Militant undertakes to give the spirit of the University a political rating in as many towns as can seize the point of it.

Its persuasion that this spirit has, by rights, a primary jurisdiction in practical affairs, is not tentative, but confident and well tried.

The writer has spent all his working years in finding out what is the matter with Society. To escape from the waste of guessing he has subjected himself to the contrasting disciplines of the three Sociological professions — the Law, the Church, and the News.

He is a member of the New York bar, was one time rector of St. James' Church in Syracuse — now called a "cathedral" — and for some years has been writing editorials for the Hearst newspapers. He has thus triangulated his problem, as an astronomer does.

What is written herein is submitted as good law, good theology, and good journalism. The fact that it could not be pleaded in any existing court, preached from any known pulpit or printed in any extant newspaper, judges not it, but them.

It will have its day in court, in church and in the despatches. Or else there will be the Fates to pay.

NATIONAL ARTS CLUB
Gramercy Park, New York
April 15th, 1911

STANFORD LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY MILITANT

I

INTRODUCTORY

WHEN the Master of History sends into the world a great idea, He does not work it out in a day. He takes time. Nobody ever understood a great idea until after it had been knocked around the world for a thousand years or so. When the idea first makes its appearance, it is scarcely an idea at all; it is a passion. Nobody has it — it has somebody by the vitals. It masters him, as Heine says, and forces him into the arena, where, like a gladiator, he is compelled, whether he will or no, to fight for it.

Next the idea gets itself uttered in the form of an institution — an institution all poetry and pure flame — totally misunderstood and unintelligible, until it has burned itself up and passed out of existence, covering the whole earth with good wood-ashes. Then a few careless ages slip away, and behold! the white ashes are wheat. Your big idea is ready for business.

It is after this fashion that the world is dealing

with the university idea. We have not yet seen a university, the real thing — sap-full and substantial. We have had only the fine ardor of Abelard and his contemporaries — and the fructifying ashes. We have had the prophetic type and the ages of expectation; it is full time for the antitype, the actual event — full time for the veritable thing itself to happen.

Now the university, in its original and essential character, has some sort of a distant relationship to the institutions that have lately been going by the name, but the family likeness is not emphatic. Harvard University and the so-called University of California, for example, bear about the same relation to the essential university idea that Mrs. Eddy's Church or the excellent Society of Universalists bears to the world-historic church idea. The university idea has hard work to find itself in any sort of superior academy or finishing school for young ladies and gentlemen.

The university is a social and political conception — the modern and democratic mode of social organization. It is social organization for the promotion of the humanities.

The humanities mean the happiness of everybody — what the fathers called the general welfare. And that is a very different thing from the thing that the undemocratic governments of the

old world have aimed at. Aristocratic governments are not concerned about the happiness of everybody. They exist to promote the happiness of those that they adjudge to be worthy of happiness, and to make sure of the unhappiness of such as are accounted worthy of being miserable. Government, according to the Old World way of thinking, is a superhuman thing. It does not feel as live men feel or see as they see. Its characteristic symbol is a fair woman without a heart, iron scales in her hand and scales upon her eyes — or blinded with a bandage.

Aristocratic government is the sworn enemy of the humanities and of the free, uncalculating fine arts. It is conscientiously opposed to all that sort of thing — opposed, at any rate, to giving real and practical significance to that sort of thing. It follows as a matter of course that the university, under the aristocratic régime, must be a pale, etiolated affair, with the blood dried out; a kind of gibbering ghost, full of reminiscence and prophecy, but having nothing to say in the present tense. Its humanities must, before all things, be polite and cautious. They must not on any account affront the studied inhumanities of the blind goddess of justice. And as for the fine arts, it behooves them to be so fine that only the elect can view them with the natural eye.

Now the significant fact, surprising as it may seem, is that our soi-disant universities in America are in their theory and ground-plan wholly and simply aristocratic. They have grown comparatively cheap and accessible, to be sure, but that does not change their nature. A thing is not democratic because it is cheap. The American colleges have grown up under the shadow of Europe, and they have not had much sun and wind in their cloisters up to the present time. It took eight years for the American Revolution, and then a full century and a quarter more to finish it up and bury the dead.

We are just beginning to get clear of the coasts of Europe. And the college authorities are likely to be the last of the passengers to sight Fire Island and Sandy Hook. The whole scheme of our American colleges has been adjusted to the aristocratic theory that the public is at best a docile fool and that only the certificated schoolmaster is wise. The professors have stood in a purely pedagogic attitude toward the people. This being understood, it is to be set down to the credit of our democracy, as a mitigating circumstance, that only helpless boys and girls have submitted to go to college. In the Middle Ages men and women went. But then the case was altogether different. In that rosy dawn of the university idea the university was

democratic. In the twelfth century the university was a self-governing commonwealth. The students had the suffrage and managed the corporation; the professors did not speak *de haut en bas* like princes and bishops.

A university, properly speaking, exists to get at the truth — the truth of human nature and of the nature of things. And when it begins by despising the unsophisticated human instincts and the common experience of men at work in the real world, it begins by blowing its brains out. A university governed not by living and learning people, but by officers of state or administrators of estates, is no university at all. In some cases it is nothing worth mentioning; but if it is anything, it is an academy, a college or a technical school. The university idea is not in it — unless as a protesting spirit, a Nemesis of outraged art and science. For the fact is that officers of state and the administrators of estates are *ipso facto* the devoted protagonists of the existing conventionalities in politics, in religion, in science, in art, in everything. And, as officers and administrators, the business of getting at the truth is simply not in their line. They may indeed have another character as well — human interests apart from their official duty. But so far as they are "true to their trust" they are bound to see that society shall not get any

nearer the truth than it is — that the existing conventional substitutes shall be made to serve their time.

The business of getting at the truth always flies in the face of conventionality, of the things agreed upon. The things agreed upon are, in fact, the only real obstacles to artistic and scientific progress. The sciences and the arts have advanced with such incredible slowness through the ages, not because of any natural difficulty — there was no lack of natural faculty and no lack of plastic materials; the advance has been so slow wholly because of the conventional and artificial difficulties. The advance of the arts and sciences has always and inevitably tended to the unsettling, the mobilizing of existing social arrangements; and these same worthy officers of state and administrators of estates have always stood in the front of the battle, with set teeth, to defend the *status quo*. It is no shame to them. They did of old the best they knew, and doubtless are still doing it. But they do not understand the meaning of the university, and cannot learn.

The university does not indeed set itself in stubborn opposition to any of the existing arrangements of law or custom. It simply regards them as it regards any other phenomena within the field of science — as things to be questioned and

looked into; to be looked through, if possible, for the discovery of something beyond them more real and respectable than they are. And that is a temper of mind that in the nature of the case can never be other than antipathetic to people that draw salaries through the faithful defence of old statutes and dead men's estates.

We hear a great deal of talk in these days about academic freedom; impatient reformers say hard and inconsiderate words about the boards of trustees and boards of regents that refuse to college professors the supposed inalienable right of saying anything they please. The hard words are inconsiderate because they come nowhere near the root of the matter. The fault is not in the governing boards of the college — in any special sense; it is in the whole frame and structure of the institutions from top to bottom. So long as the things called universities are what they are — aristocratic institutions — they must be governed, if governed at all, on aristocratic principles. When the real and democratic university arises, it will doubtless be governed on democratic principles — the teachers will keep their places as long as the plain people can believe in them. Meanwhile the professors in colleges who claim the right to say in their class-rooms whatever they happen to think, or even what the mass of the people who

do not go to college happen to think, will without doubt continue to find themselves out of court. The fond ideal of intellectual liberty in a well-endowed moral vacuum never has been realized upon the earth; and, for the sake of intellectual and moral virility, it is to be hoped that it never will be. Even the cherubim and seraphim have their responsibilities and are obliged to keep on good terms with somebody in order to hold their places in the orchestra of heaven.

The rise of the industrial order is bound up with the renaissance of the university idea. The organization of industry on a grand scale requires the organization of the people, in the spirit of the arts and sciences. In the absence of such an organization of the people, the people are bound to be slaves of the machine; there is no help for it either under the existing plutocratic régime or under that promised order of politico-economic centralization which is now dangling its Dead Sea apples before our eyes under the name of "scientific" socialism.

This spirit of the arts and sciences is the quintessential religion of modern times — that living, working faith in the moral soundness of human nature and the nature of things, which is finding in the constitution of the universe the sufficient statutes of social order and is putting all extrinsic

authorities out of business. Without this faith and the organization of society on the basis of this faith, the people would inevitably be crushed by the machinery of modern civilization. But the people will not be crushed. Not in America, at least. For in America the university of the people is a fact practically assured by the whole course of our history.

It is a matter of no little significance, as bearing on this point, that the frontier of American civilization in its sweep across the continent has always been marked and spaced by an unbroken sentry-line of school-houses. The farther you go west, the more school-houses there are in proportion to the census of souls. The longer the haul and the steeper the grade as you go up the slope of the Great Divide, the more recklessly do the people pay the freight — for schools. And the "genius of these States" sits throned on the Sierras in Arizona, quaffing a cup of knowledge that is paid for by the highest school-tax rate in the whole world.

Those who would argue from this state of affairs that the moving man in the New World is specially great for book-learning are superficial or misinformed. The American people have never had an overweening respect for schoolmasters. The history of our public school system shows that

Americans generally have not cared much either for the quality or the quantity of their schoolmastering — have regarded the scholastic processes as a kind of pious ritual to be got through with in a penitent spirit — with generous congratulations and cheers for the superior sort of men, the Washingtons and Lincolns, who have been counted worthy to escape the punishment of a scholastic education.

The American people have a spiritual passion as strong as their mastery of materials, and the "little red school-house" has stood in our imagination, not so much a thing of utilitarian value as a thing of spiritual significance — a homely, thrilling symbol of the conquest of matter by mind, the victorious march of the creative spirit of man across the deserts and wildernesses of the world. The school-house has served as the church of the religion of democracy, the shrine of our secret but sincere devotion, and that, not because of, but in spite of its heritage of pedantry and prose.

The revolution now in progress in what is called the science and art of pedagogics amounts to nothing less than the complete overthrow of the schoolmaster, the abolishment of the reign of the pedagogue.

And this overthrow of the schoolmaster is the final step in the evolution of democratic society.

For the strength of all economic and political monopoly has lain in the thralldom of the intellect to the formularies of the past. Up to this time the dead hand of the old order of the world has held fast its mortgage upon the future through its clutch upon the minds of the children. But that clutch is loosening now; even the children at length are to go free. And the defeat of the schoolmaster carries with it the defeat of the master of the sword and of the purse. With the pedagogues cast out, grown men can without shame go to school. Every man becomes a teacher — and a learner. And so with every child. And there is not a school-house in the republic but is destined to become a university of the people, a nerve-ganglion of the new social organization in the spirit of the arts and sciences.

II

THE NEW POLITICAL ECONOMY

IN the mediæval university theology was "the queen of the sciences." The modern university moves toward the conception that the dominant and all-correlating interest of learning is sociology. And sociology is only a new-found and bookish name for political economy in its widest aspect. So we may venture to say that in that university of the people which is now in the making it will be understood that political economy is the queen of the sciences — the sovereign mistress of all the arts as well.

In the cloistered universities of our day, although the name of theology has suffered some discredit, the professorial mind is still riveted to the theological point of view. The good-men of the gown still look upon Truth as a transcendental thing, fit only for contemplation and worship, a word to be spelled with a capital letter. As the truth comes more and more to be thought of as the sum of those urgent realities with which we must wrestle in making ourselves a place in

the universe, the transcendentalism of learning gives place to a frank pragmatism. Theology is transmuted into sociology as the intellect girds itself to make the fortune of humanity in the real world. This change of philosophic view-point implies and requires that the university must abandon its classic shades and set up its standard in the market-place. The institution whose master-passion is to subdue the earth and build the cities ceases to be a reservation for book-men and becomes the rallying-ground of the workers and those that think in the concrete. It becomes the public school of grown men, the institutional basis of democratic law, the political primary of the new industrial order.

Political economy is the study of the laws of the universe for the purpose of finding out how to increase the wealth of men in the mass. The study begins with the assumption that there are universal laws of wealth, laws that exist in the nature of man and the nature of things. It assumes that the raising of the general standard of living is a reasonable and practicable aim, that there is no necessary opposition between the real wealth of a particular person and that of any and all others. It assumes, in short, that the universe is moral and rational in its ground-plan. There could be no such thing as political or public econ-

omy, if wealth in one quarter necessarily implied poverty in another; there could be only a personal and private economy.

This study is both an art and a science, but it is not peculiar in this respect, since all studies are barren that are not at once artistic and scientific, and we can have real knowledge of the facts of nature only by making trial of them in the prosecution of our designs. True political economy, therefore, frankly addresses itself not only to the discovery, but also to the enforcement of the laws of wealth-production.

Wealth, in the technical sense of economics, is that portion of the means of human welfare that is produced by work. The natural conditions of existence come within the scope of political economy only so far as they submit themselves to processes of improvement under the will of the artist and the worker. This investigation does not deal primarily with the sun, moon and stars, or with the mysterious springs of health; there is an infinite world without, and also an infinite world within us, that only remotely relates itself to our study. Political economy immediately concerns itself with the *improvable* relations between men and the materials of their environment.

It is the note of man, as distinguished from the beasts, that he can by conscious effort better his

standing in the material world. Characteristically a man is a worker, a creator of values, a world-maker. He alone, of all living things, can conceive designs and execute them, can imagine conditions that do not exist, and then by patience bring them to pass. To take the world wholly as one finds it and leave it so is brutal. A man is a man only because he is a wealth-producer, an enricher of existence.

All wealth is sacramental; it is to be known by this sign, that it is a means of grace, an embodiment of the human ideal. It is the physical vehicle of something that is not physical. An item of wealth is a palpable thing vitalized by the human will with a spiritual quality, a power to sustain life. Things endowed with this life-sustaining quality, but existing independent of the effort of men — the sea, the open air — are not indeed to be regarded as wealth, in the sense of this study. But there is no man-engendered value — the touch of a good physician, the song of a sweet singer — that can, without intellectual confusion, be excluded from the purview of political economy.

The old economists said that wealth is "that which has exchange value"; that all things are wealth that are bought and sold in the market. This was a definition by accident, and not by essence. It is true that most things that are really

wealth are bought and sold; but it is not the marketing that proves them wealth. The definition left the study of economics bottomless. For to say that wealth is that which has value in exchange was as if one should say that wealth is anything that anybody *thinks* is wealth and will pay for. Thus their science of economics was no science at all; for there can be no science of whims and fashions. It was dismal because it was without light or leading — a heart-sickening labyrinth that led nowhither. Starting with such a definition of its subject-matter, the old economics could establish no sound relations with the nature of man or the nature of things. It broke with art and science and committed itself to bewildering and fruitless speculations.

The new economy is solidly grounded in the facts of human nature and the material world. It insists that wealth is that, and that only, which is really good for something — man being what he is and things what they are; that it is the sum of all good things produced by the energy of human good-will.

Political economy hitherto has had but a distant and contingent relation to politics and positive law; thus its name has seemed ill-chosen. But the new political economy is political indeed. It promises to draw into its own field all the passion

of politics and all the force of law. It is no longer content to tabulate statistics or to explain the phenomena of glut and hunger. It has added to its intelligence a will. It has a purpose and a programme. Economy is, by etymology, house-keeping; and the new political economy intends to keep house.

All the grand interests of society are gravitating toward the problem of wealth-creating. It is in this all-absorbing interest that one finds the emotional centre of the age in which we live. The new political economy undertakes to exhibit the action of the immutable laws of art and science. It would show how to build cities that will stand the strain of nature, how to increase the leverage of the human arm for the subdual of the earth, how to make goods cheap and men dear. We awake to the discovery that such are the true aims of government and law. We are convinced that these concerns are the core of sound education also. And we are sure that nothing lies nearer the heart of religion. Thus the genius of the new political economy stands at the cross-roads where all ways meet.

The three following chapters undertake to show how the three capital interests of society — politics, education, religion — are, in their actual lines of development, converging toward a common

issue. They all are striving together toward the solution of the problem which is the special preoccupation of the new economics, to wit: How to make the human spirit more at home in the material world.

III

WHAT IS GOVERNMENT FOR?

THE saying of Edmund Burke, that a state is a "partnership in the arts and sciences, in every virtue and in all perfection," has until recent times been taken by the English-speaking race as mere literature. But it was prophecy. The real political revolution is not in the triumph of the *bourgeoisie* over the aristocrats, or of the proletarians over the middle class; it is in the triumph of the idea of the state as a working-partnership over the idea of the state as a sovereign power. The real revolution is a new orientation of the mind; it puts into the minds of the people a new conception of the meaning and end of government, a new idea of what the law is, and what it is for.

The old régime, from which we are beginning to shake ourselves free, believed in the state as a sovereign power. This power had, in its development, two principal phases, as has been shown, with sun-clear lucidity, by Sir Henry Maine. It was first based upon caste or "status," and then upon contract or "the consent of the governed,"

but in both cases government held itself aloof from the working world. Its law had no clear correspondence with the laws of art and science; it was not affected by technological considerations; it disregarded the engineering problem as to how best to raise the general standard of living and put the people in possession of the earth. On the contrary, it undertook to supplant the natural laws of evolution by legal conventionalities — first, the conventionalities of custom, then those of contract.

Nobody questions that the systems of status were devoid of social enterprise; they rested frankly upon old habits. It has been supposed, however, that the advent of the "social contract" changed all that. But it did not. It did not break the sway of custom, put enterprise into the law or make the state a working-partnership. The theory of the social contract was broached by Hobbes in the interest of absolutism, by Locke as a defender of constitutional monarchy, and by Rousseau as the herald of the French Revolution; in one form or another it has been accepted by most modern lawyers and political speculators. But plainly it has no power to abolish the rule of privilege. In the shape in which the theory still possesses men's minds in this country, the law of the land is thought of as existing not to clear a way for the advancement of the arts and sciences,

but merely to consecrate and enforce all actual bargains, beginning with the contract made by the fathers of the Federal Constitution and proceeding thence to every man's account with his grocer. According to this view, the law is merely a force to compel men to keep their promises. The symbol of its justice is, as has been said, a blinded goddess with scales in her hands. She sees nothing, feels nothing, save only the balancing of the accounts between man and man. Her law is superhuman or subhuman. Her spirit is passionless and abstracted. She knows not the bounding pulse of ambition or the fierce struggle for a fuller life. She has no creative ideals, no art. The elemental world also she utterly ignores. For her there are no deserts to be watered, no wildernesses to be cleared; she is no city-builder. The book of chemistry and physics is sealed to her eyes. She would do what she calls justice though the heavens fell; would enforce a bonded bargain though it devastate the earth.

Because this blind goddess of contractual justice denies our social "partnership in the arts and sciences," her sway is now questioned by the modern spirit, and the real political revolution is at length lifting its standards of revolt. Because she has broken all the laws of life, the imperative and unconventional ordinances of science, because she has

respected only the things agreed upon, she is branded "Arch-anarchist" by the men of the modern spirit — and her rule is proscribed.

The new politics bases itself not upon any conventional arrangements whatever, not upon a written constitution or a traditional one, but upon those immutable and self-vindicating laws that fix the conditions of human progress — *the articles of the constitution of the universe.* A programme is not good merely because it has been agreed upon; a bargain is not made just by being signed and sealed; and nobody has a right to stand in the way of civilization merely because it has been so written in a bond. Gravitation and the chemical affinities, the inspiration of artists, the enterprising hands of engineers, and the hearts of lovers, all alike are in conspiracy to "impair the obligations of contracts." It is settled that the most imperative obligation of law is to create the artistic and scientific conditions of social existence. The authority of civil law lies in its congruity with the natural laws of growth and improvement; and the test of the constitutionality of a statute is this: Does its operation tend to raise the purchasing-power of a day's work?

It is only with the prevalence of such a conception of the source and sanction of law that the civil order becomes indeed a partnership for the

advancement of the arts and sciences. The mental revolution which is to bring this momentous change to pass is now in full career. The day is at hand in which it shall be possible for a lawyer to stand up in court and say: "I admit that I am not in line with the precedents, but I ask for judgment on technological grounds. The law exists to mobilize the creative forces of society; and I am able to show that the case of my client is in line with the sound rules of city-building."

It was possible for the non-industrial ages to draft their codes of law in disregard of the general engineering problem. They could settle their questions of right and wrong, without considering how to put tools into the hands that could use them. But this age of ours, with its eager engrossment in the earth-struggle, cannot continue to do that. The law of industrial societies must become technological — artistic, scientific. The whole fabric of the old conventional law is weakening, day by day. John Marshall is dead. The Dartmouth College case has been reversed by the exigencies of economics. Nothing in political constitutions or corporate charters can keep us from fixing the rates of railroads — yes, and the salaries of their managers — if the mobilization of our working forces seems to require it. Trades unions shall be governed "by injunction," or anyhow, rather than

that they shall impede the circulation of the blood of commerce. The local political sovereignties of South Africa, Burmah, Corea, the Philippines, Mexico, go down before the invincible standard of business. Sometimes treacherous and hypocritical have been the hands that have lifted that standard. The great capitalists, who dominate the political cabinets, have not striven for the advancement of the world's work so much as for the establishment of their own privileges. Yet it is they that have raised the cry that nothing, no old custom, no vested and immemorial right, shall bar the way of an advancing civilization. The great market-men and promoters have set the copy; and it shall go hard but the people will better their instruction. For not in the interest of the rich or of the poor, the strong or weak, but in the interest of all — the imperative law of human progress is rising up irresistible, to overwhelm those who rely upon vested rights and prescriptive titles. It is plainly to be seen that the law that is destined to rule the world-wide circle of commerce cannot be a law invented by those who sit in councils and cabinets; it is to be discovered by explorers and prospectors, by artists and engineers — working out-of-doors.

The vast transformation that is being wrought in the spirit of politics requires that the forms

and methods of politics should also undergo a great change. Political parties are passing away. Sectarian religion and partisan politics are complementary monstrosities; it follows that if one of these is lying *in extremis,* the other also must be gasping for breath. And so it is in fact; the sectarian churches and the political parties are languishing together. But of course they cannot pass out of existence until they are crowded by institutional forms that are more fit to hold the ground they occupy.

Regarding, then, the social problem from the political point of view, we feel the need of some new political institution to embody the new spirit of law. There should exist in every country town and city ward some kind of a permanent political primary to focalize the demand of the people for the new kind of law. It is toward the creation of such an institution that the lines of American politics are now running.

Political parties have never aimed directly at the things men really care about; they have been curiously circuitous. They have never struck hard and forthright for better food, clothes, and houses and the chance for a freer and more effective life. They have never gone to the point, but have always sunk the end in the means. The party managers have said: "Give us power; and then

we will do good." But they have gambled away the goods in pursuit of the power. The true aim of politics is to secure the mastery of materials under the hand of the human ideal. But party politics seduce the people from this aim, to an internecine struggle for the subjection of one another. Every practical advantage for the earth-wrestle is systematically sacrificed to the hope of domination. The partisan programmes for social melioration are designedly tenuous and theoretic; for only thus can they spread their spell over wide areas and successfully appeal to the vague idealism of great masses. There is nothing so impractical as "practical politics." For a programme is less and less practicable in proportion to the number of people that must be got to agree upon it; and a political economy that can do nothing until it has got a majority of ninety millions to think alike has reached the vanishing-point of chimeras; it is no economy at all.

For example, politicians nowadays are crying: "Let us, bye and bye, revise the tariff;" and other politicians are crying: "Let us 'stand pat.'" As a matter of party politics, the issue thus framed is all that could be desired. It is exactly suited to the exigencies of the struggle for political power — for the domination of the minority by the majority. There is in it the indespensable refer-

ence to grandiose philosophic generalizations, without which it is impossible to stir the stagnant moralism of the mass-man. The pure catholicism of "free trade" is set against the passionate protestantism of "protection." But this battle of the Titans is thrust skillfully into the background, to be seen dimly through a haze — a fabulous contest, going on forever. In the foreground is a very absorbing scrimmage for personal and sectional privilege. This monogram of dim idealism and crass egotism is the signature of party politics; there is none genuine without it.

The point here is missed if one supposes that the indirection and baseness are due to the *corruption* of parties; they inhere in the *nature* of parties. The pursuit of political power is necessarily hypocritical, since parties cannot live otherwise than by preferring political power to the serviceable control of nature. Genuine political economy is not in them, simply because political economy aims at the subjection of nature by men in the mass, and not at the domination of one class over another.

The rise and fall of party politics is only an episode in American history. It must be remembered that the local caucus and convention system was unimagined before the days of Andrew Jackson. It met the general conditions of a crude and

ill-balanced social state, a society in which the mental atmosphere throughout was charged with the wildest idealism and the coarsest egotism. The psychology of party politics is, as has been suggested, identical with that of sectarian religion; and the great political parties in America have been in effect religious sects, filled with the fanaticism and hypocrisy of professional piety.

Popular government does indeed require the political organization of the mass of the people; but the parties have accomplished this organization in a manner that is seen to be completely abortive, since they have afforded promotion and a career not to those who serve the public, but to the servants of the party machine. The true type of popular political organization is an association of the people of a municipality to raise the standard of living in that place. It should have a structural shape as definite and highly differentiated as that of Tammany Hall or a parish of the mediæval Church, and should devote itself undividedly to the business of bringing men into more stimulating and nourishing relations to the natural world. But, as has been said, the paths of current religious and educational development are running to the same issues as those of politics. The all-the-year-'round political primary which

shall at length show the true, well-nucleated germ-cell of democratic industrial society must be not merely political; it must have a religious and educational character also — as will be indicated in the two succeeding chapters.

IV

WHAT IS THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH?

"MAN," says Thomas Hobbes, "has the exclusive privilege of forming general theories. But this privilege is alloyed by another, that is, the privilege of absurdity — to which no living creature is subject but man only."

What could be more absurd than the theory that the Church of the Incarnation should shut itself up in an exclusive idealism, and should have nothing to do with the real world and its social problem? That such an idea should be generally entertained in the sectarian religious establishments is proof enough that they have drifted out of the stream of the Church's world-moving and eventful life and that they have saved to themselves little of the substance along with the vocabulary of historical Christianity.

The Church of history has everything to do with the social problem. Its amazing and magnificent career is not at all intelligible when it is considered otherwise than as an attempt, on the

whole successful, to supersede the old empires by a new and revolutionary social order. The character of the revolution may be defined by the statement that under the old régime a man's practical power is determined by his social and legal standing, while under the new régime these conditions are reversed. Of old a man's place in society determined what he could do; the revolution consists in so reversing the grain of social law that what a man can do shall determine his social place.

"The princes of the Gentiles lord it over them, but it shall not be so among you. For the chief men among you shall be they that are servants of all." This comes nearer the point than the "Declaration of the Rights of Man," or any other historical document of political revolt. For the gist of modern industrial democracy is the rule of the servants, the yielding of precedence to those only who can "deliver the goods." To be sure, this rule is as yet nowhere fairly established. But when once it shall be established, it cannot be overthrown; the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

The states of the old order are destroyed by suicide; they constantly court death in the conflict that they invite between natural and legal power. The real sovereign, always and everywhere, is the economic power, and all social collisions take place

through the turning of this power against itself. The power of the purse falls into the hands of those that cannot hold the plow; the economic power that is merely documentary finds itself at war with the economic power that is real. Such is the contradiction that follows upon the attempt to set up any other rule than that of productive efficiency.

It is written that "the meek shall inherit the earth." Is it not plain that the meekness intended is that of mechanics, chemists, and artists who mind well their own business; and is it not clear that they are really destined to prevail over the self-assertive people who push and pull for social status?

How else can we hope ever to achieve a stable social equilibrium than by the identification of our working force with our police power. So long as these are two distinct and separate things, they will fight; and the course of every national career will run to a dead-lock. The enduring, the eternal city is the city whose fundamental law is industrial law, a law drawn with a view to the production of the greatest possible quantity and the best possible quality of human values. Of such a city it may be said that its foundations are unshakable. It is at peace with elemental nature. The laws of life are its *gendarmerie* to "arrest its knaves and dastards."

The mission of the Church is to restore the world to the original and normal conditions of cosmic evolution. Its method is the setting up in every community of an institution dedicated to the future — *i. e.*, to progress. This is the only institution that cannot be invalidated by lapse of time. For it is to be observed that institutions have their day and pass because they are static; while all the world is by its very nature in perpetual flux. They perish because the spirit of progress is not in them. But when progress itself becomes institutionalized, the institution is eternal. And such an institution is the Church — in its essential idea.

The State dies because it is a state; it dies of static law. It attempts to erect in this fluent, growing world a permanent establishment aloof from nature. The incurable vice of the State lies in the idea of the sovereignty of majorities — the idea of an unquestionable authority that is other than the authority of the working-will, the competent power to do good. Says Guizot in his "History of Civilization": "This idea of sovereignty — whether the authority be lodged in one, in a few, in a majority, or in all — is an iniquitous lie." For the law that is the real basis of human society is written in the indelible characters of humanity as it relates itself to the ele-

mental world. It does not depend upon the concourse of opinions. It is only superficially true that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." For justice is not to be deduced from the terms of a contract. Its kingdom is not of *toute le monde.* Whatever inures to the advancement of civilization is just, though all the returns from the polling-places should record a mandate for barbarism. Such is the orthodox doctrine of the true Church.

But the Church does not raise a red flag against the empire or against imperial democracies; that is not its way. It hates imperialism, which is the socialism of the rich; but it hates also socialism, the imperialism of the poor. Its way is to set up its standard in every community, as a new polarity of social organization, and to nurture there the organic filaments of the new order. It "wrestles not against flesh and blood"; it is not the enemy of those in power. It perceives that the real seat of imperialism is in the mob-heart of the multitude.

The enemy of the Church is sin. And what is sin? At bottom it is disbelief. In what? In the practicability of one's own human ideal. Sin is, by etymology, a split, a schism; it is the breach that is wrought in a man's own nature when he dares not venture to believe that the ideal — the imperative law of his inner constitution — can

make itself at home in the real world, dares not believe that the materials of science are plastic under the hand of art. Thenceforth he is no longer a whole man (holy? how wise are the suggestions of radical and primitive words!), no longer sane (a saint, shall we say?), for a great flaw or fault has cut across his soul. There is begotten a fateful lesion, a breach of continuity between his instincts and his intellect. The divine and elemental passion in him, balked of its healthy issue in creative work, wears with destructive friction against the frame of his ordered knowledge. It bursts into a consuming flame to destroy his consciousness, his will, his very life. Such is the story of the spiritual experts, the doctors of conscience, the great confessors. And this is sin. It is not the doing or leaving undone of this or that that conventional morality enjoins. It is spiritual death engendered by unfaith. And man is to be "saved" not by morality, but by religion — the heartening of his own heart. He was condemned to drudgery and death not for his poetry, but for his desperate prose; not for his adventure, but for his cautious fear. Adam, in the old Hebrew story, dared not dress and keep the garden under the *naive* guidance of his own spirit; he shrank from the adventure of life, and would know first what the authorities would approve. His in-

stincts cowered before his intellect; so he ate of the "tree of knowledge of good and evil." Thus for him art was turned to weariness and toil. It is a great symbol, and an epitome of all history. The Church was right in saying that the sin of Adam has corrupted the whole world. For there is nothing the matter with the world but this, that everywhere the heart is in bondage to the head — everywhere the creative imagination of men lies under the thralldom of dead memories.

The next man one meets in the streets will be seen to be living two lives, and between these two lives there is no communion. His will is utterly divided and he becomes by turns, in all possible sincerity, optimist and pessimist, egotist and altruist, a devout patriot ready to die for his country, and a devourer of widows' houses. So universal is the truth in Robert Louis Stevenson's dreadful story of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.

The Church is not to be identified with any ecclesiastical system that has as yet appeared; yet it reaches ever forward to embody itself in solid and structural forms. The Protestants are right, and the Catholics are also right; the kingdom of heaven is a spiritual kingdom, whose throne is in the private heart, and yet it can never rest until it has become a territorial institution, commanding

the forum and the market-place with visible and unquestionable sway.

The mediæval Church was a great political and social achievement. It did not limit its aim to the propagation of a religious cult; its cathedrals were not merely places of worship. They were public schools, guild-halls and court-houses, and they were the most impressive monuments of successful art and science that the world has yet seen. At the beginning of the sixteenth century the social-revolutionary idea of the Church had been carried as far as it could go under the auspices of priests and professional religious persons. For essential religion, in realizing itself, necessarily destroys the institutions of professional piety. This is so because it is impossible for integrated minds to think of religion as a thing standing apart by itself; it transfuses the whole of life.

The inner meaning of the Reformation was the descent of the world-renewing spirit of Christianity from the high altars to the open road and the market-square. Thenceforth the young upspringing nations became the defenders of the Faith. Secular society, in its implicit, unrealized design, became the true continuator of the historic Church. It took upon itself the Church's offices — equity jurisprudence, public education, the charge of hospitals and alms-houses — and it be-

came the vehicle of the Church's spiritual tradition, bearing the burden and message of liberty, equality and fraternity.

What is the matter with the sectarian churches in the United States? The matter is that they have little or nothing to do with the Church of history. They have been thrust summarily out of the field of our secular order and have been forbidden to meddle with its concerns — notwithstanding the fact that these concerns are the real concerns of historical Christianity. There is a current illusion that Protestant churches have voluntarily and in obedience to their own inner law renounced "temporal power" and territorial jurisdiction. The facts of history do not support that theory. The truth is that modern democratic society has everywhere driven the churches out of its forum. And the deeper fact is that the sectarian churches are not properly churches at all, but spiritualistic cults not different in motive or social function from those cults of Orpheus, Eleusis or Mithras that flourished in the old and decaying Mediterranean world. They minister to the heart-sickness, the nostalgia of those who have been spiritually dislocated by the social contortions of a dying order; and who dare not make a practical adventure of their hopes for the renewing of the world. They are refuges, not of faith, but of un-

faith. Their profound esoterism, their shadowy other-worldliness is a secret apostasy from the task of life. The vast prevalence of these cults in the United States is a sign of the weakness of our idealism as a working force. We are rapt mystics because we are gross materialists. The brutality of our actual commerce yields so little for the soul to feed upon that we turn wistfully to sacraments and tales of miracle. It was so with those who thronged the altars of the Eleusinian mysteries.

Of course the Church, even in its best estate, always had house-room for this wistful and pathetic faithlessness. But in the great days this was not the life of the Church; it was the burden laid upon its life. The Church had something else — an enterprising and world-compelling faith. And the point here is that that confident missionary enterprise passed, at the Reformation, into the body of secular society, leaving the modern religious cults to be the inheritors not of the Church's faith, but only of its abandoned fears.

It is to be admitted that even to-day and in the United States the sects draw powerfully upon what is wholesomest in the community — its youth, its real faith. Such is the magic of great historic names and symbols. But neither youth nor faith can by any means prevail in the councils of eccle-

siastics. There is a fatality that determines otherwise. There is that in the set and grain of the sectarian corporations — in their historical momentum — that makes it impossible for them to bear upon real issues and the building of the cities. It is nobody's fault; and it is as vain to chide the bishop as to blame the verger. The path of the mediæval Church ran toward the centre of civic life; the paths of the sectarian corporations of our day trend away from that centre. And it is foolhardy for reforming clergymen or laymen to run counter to a fact of such magnitude; individuals can make history only by obeying its laws.

The impracticability of the sectarian churches is their *raison d'être;* if they had any considerable bearing upon business and the work-a-day world, they would lose their support and would cease to exist. Men of affairs feel their souls crushed in the vast machine of modern business and they hunger and thirst for a realm of utterly abstract idealism — to redress the balance of their morbid lives. That is why they pay their money to maintain the super-sensuous rituals and the miraculous, unearthly dogmas. To be sure, it is not true and never has been true that the privileged classes pay the mystagogues, of set and contractual purpose, in order that the mystagogues may deceive the people and so maintain the iniquities of privilege.

Human nature has never been so mean as that. But it is true that the institutions of supernaturalism are begotten of the faithless sordidness of men's lives and that they react to perpetuate that sordidness.

The logic of the situation in America is that those who have some appreciation of the social mission of the Church in history would be wise to abandon the thought of making the sectarian corporations the agents of that mission. Such persons should cease to be sectarians themselves and should withhold their support from all forms of sectarianism. The true life of the Church is to be found in the body of secular society. The day is past for the organization of religious society in aloofness from the secular order. The present work of the Church is to organize secular society on a religious basis; *i. e.*, to bring our democratic communities to understand that their real constitutional law is an eternal, an unconventional law — a law that is grounded in the moral order of the universe.

There is in the American people a dumb conviction of high spiritual destiny — a feeling that we are the trustees of an order that is to be permanent and of universal validity. This conviction cries now to be defined and articulated. If the heretics who are being driven out of the sec-

tarian churches would not look back, if they would resolutely put their hands to the work of building the institution of religion in the middle of the market-place, they would find there the people and a sufficient store of materials. They would have the material support that it is impossible for an enterprising faith to find in the cults of a transcendental goodness.

The next chapter will venture to forecast the tangible form of the church of the religion of democracy, and to suggest something of the vocabulary of which it is likely to make use.

V

WHAT IS A SCHOOL?

IT is common for American fathers to say, "I send my boy to school in order that he may have a better chance in life than I had." Thoughtless people with an old-world bias still suppose that the schools exist to bring up the rising generation to the level of that which is passing — to make the children like their parents. But your genuine American knows better. He knows that in this country the schools exist not to make the children like their parents, but to make them different — and to make the children's world different from the world of their fathers. The American public school is a tremendous enterprise in social regeneration. Spite of all the blare of our trumpets, our grown-folk are dissatisfied both with their own achievements and with the conditions of life as they have found them. And their vast sacrifice in order that the children "may have a better chance" is the age's Grail-quest and martyrdom, its man-endearing *auto da fé*. There is nothing greater in our actual social order than this grim resolution to supersede it by something better.

Of old it was fabled that the god Chronos ate his children, but our Father Time gives his flesh as broken bread to his offspring, that they may go in the strength of that meat to the building of a city that shall outlast Time. The feudal ages built cathedrals and went on pilgrimages to holy graves; America went on pioneering pilgrimages and built public schools. In those unsung crusades which in the last century flung out their faith against the wilderness, advancing steadily from meridian to meridian — a sweeping line of outposts — wherever the prairie schooner stopped, the pilgrims built a school-house. As has been said, it was not that they cared overweeningly for books and pedagogues. But they could not raise up shrines to the Virgin and saints as the old crusaders did, and so they built schools — out of logs or sods or adobe bricks — as votive-offerings to the God of the religion of democracy, and witnesses to their faith that there in nothing in the mountains or the desert that is not tamable under the hand of the ideal.

All Americans are millennialists, after a fashion. We believe in the visible coming of the kingdom; and the public school is the bone and tissue of the new order, growing in the womb of the old. The point is that the educational principle as we understand it is identical with the evolutionary

principle. The public school system is rightly conceived of as the adumbration of a new civil polity, one framed not to keep things fixed, but to keep things moving. Or say rather that the new polity is to be a living body framed to grow. On the other hand, the political order under which we are now trying to live cannot be regarded as a mobilization for the march of democracy, but rather as a cunningly devised system of checks and disciplines to keep us from beating a panic retreat to feudalism.

Probably the socially regenerative character of schools has always and in all lands been more or less faintly realized, although it has been left for America to bring the feeling into clear consciousness. In the great imperial schools of Rome, it seems indeed that Time devoured his children without wincing and the Past lorded it frankly over the Future; but who will say just that of the Academy at Athens, or of Hypatia's school, or Abelard's? Would men anywhere ever have thought of such a thing as the making of a school — the creation of a little artificial world for their children to take breath and grow up in — had they not secretly repudiated the law and order of their own living? May we not set it down as a first principle in pedagogics that the best education for a child would be to think and

pray with his own mother and work in his father's shop — if only the men and women of the world could think straight and work straight? It is because the workers of the world have not been able to think and the thinkers have not been able to work out their thoughts, that they have sent their children into a little fenced place apart from the turmoil of life — a place open to the earth and the sky — in the ceaseless hope that they might there knit up the ravelled edges of existence and make a new beginning for humanity.

To-day in the United States you send your boy to school in the hope that he may conceive ideals and learn facts — and that the former may stand in working relations with the latter. You understand perfectly well that the distinctive work of the school is not the multiplying of ideas or the multiplying of facts, but the reassuring and establishing of the heart and head of a youth so that indomitably his heart and head shall work together, and, to the end of his life, nothing shall loosen the grip of what the boy feels to be right upon what he knows to be real. A good schooling consists in the tightening of the hold of one's ideals upon his facts. Ideals can be got out of school as well as in, and facts can be got better. But in the drift of ordinary out-in-the-world expe-

rience you cannot always get for your boy this heartening of the brain which it is the school's work to give — this innervation of the heart. And the reason is that the society of grown men as it exists is abnormal and decomposed. You would not send your boy to the parochial clergy, to the working politicians, lawyers, or newspaper men, to get his primary lessons in the thinking of whole thoughts, because you perceive that the out-givings of these classes on life, duty, law, and judgment are in general not the real thoughts of living men, but only their professional traditions. On the other hand, you can scarcely expect your son to be a creative artist or master of materials if you put him, without preliminary mental bracing, into the office of a working architect, engineer, or manufacturer; for his conceptive mind will be overwhelmed there and beaten flat by a hail of innumerable details.

It is not necessary to infer from these reflections that all our neighbors are mean, but only that the actual social constitution puts an excessive strain upon human nature. There are social forces, forces of disease and death, that are not begotten of the wills of men, but rather of their inherited fears and failures. Thus it happens that sometimes men are gibbeted in the midst of universal pity, as John Brown was, and probably most of the Chris-

tian martyrs, beginning with the First of all — or lifted to the high places in spite of universal dislike, as many a king has been and many an "available" politician. In a diseased social order, though all men should will the right, they could not perform it, because of the deformity of their institutions — since institutions are to society what feet and hands are to the mind of the individual man.

Our system of education is then the germ of a new order. It contains within itself all the organs, the institutions of a society that shall be at once conceptive and capable — fulfilling high designs. The broadest and plainest fact about the history of society hitherto is its disappointment, its recurrent dead-lock and self-destruction. There is an important sense in which one may say that social progress has not yet fairly begun. *There has been no real and important social progress hitherto — only a slow movement through the difficult lessons of disaster toward those grounds of social health upon which for the first time it shall be possible to make gains that cannot be lost.* The story of human experience has not yet reached the date of the beginning of true evolutionary society; it has marked only the myriad phases of a revolution — a stupendous shifting of the social centre of gravity from temporal to eternal law —

i. e., from the innumerable constitutions of conventionalism to the solid and permanent basis of art and science.

We have not yet finished the revolution, though the worst, let us hope, is past. Not yet have we fully escaped from the land of Utopias, or abandoned the thought of establishing an unquestionable authority and finishing off a perfect state. We have not yet arrived upon the firm ground of nature and cosmic evolutionary law. But we should take heart, for we have made all the stages of a mighty spiritual pilgrimage from Stygian darkness and confusion of will to the frontiers of a fair land of art and science — the gates of an imperishable civilization.

The impracticability of the old social systems has shown itself always and everywhere by an unfailing sign, to wit: the splitting of society into two parts. A yawning wound has opened across the social body from side to side — dividing the privileged and the oppressed. On one side stand always the creditor class and on the other the class of debtors, as if the former had performed huge works of supererogation and the latter works of dereliction as huge. The creditor class is always the ruling class and the debtor class is always ruled over and overruled. The former are, in spite of all political safeguards and the forms of

democracy, the makers and masters of the law; the latter are its slaves.

Surely the most considerable business of historical and social science is to explain this prodigious phenomenon — this fact of universal social schism. Demagogues, the partisans of the poor, say that the rich are wholly at fault; that when the poor complain, "the poor are always in the right." They say that the great ones in the social scale have meanly conspired and compassed the undoing of the little ones. But there is no clear historic evidence of such a plot. A cabal may be formed of four or five persons, but not of many thousands; and we are speaking now of the issue between great classes.

No, the class-schism is due to the fact that men have lacked hitherto the artistic-scientific temper in politics — the mood of factful and practical idealism. It is not the "artistic temperament" that is wanting; there has never been any lack of neurotic idealism. Nor is it the so-called "scientific spirit," for neither has there been a dearth of men who have scared themselves out of their hope and their humanity by a cold analysis of facts. The lack is always of that integral and healthy temper which is at once artistic and scientific — gripping the facts as they really are, with the hands of passion and poetry.

The class-schism, the social dead-lock, the degeneracy, the death of nations, is due to an immemorial, a universally epidemic disease — an organic breach between the instincts and the intellect. The average man is abnormal, because of the imperfect correlation between his emotional force and his knowing power. Thus a "great man" is simply a normal man. He is regarded with open-mouthed astonishment and admiration by the masses merely because he thinks with passionate interest and is intelligent in his feeling. He thinks with emotion and feels with discretion.

If social reformers generally fail to ease their groaning patient, it is because they start out with a false diagnosis of the disease. Commonly they are divided into two classes — those whose rôle it is to endeavor to make people *feel* more acutely, and those who set out to make them *think* harder. Neither of these classes can do any vital or permanent good, because, with reference to their vital strength, the mass of men think and feel already exactly as much as they can stand. The evangelists of emotion are under the illusion that there is a shortage of sympathy in the world. They suppose that love, brotherhood, altruism, if it could only be reinforced in some manner so as to beat down the cool hard-headedness of mankind, would solve all problems. They forget that for

one human being to care after his own fashion for another is as inevitable as eating, and as little susceptible to external force. The apostles of brain-stimulus, on the other hand, are fixedly sure that if they could only get into people's heads some certain exact demonstration — as George's single-tax thesis or Marx's theory of value — then all would be well. It is as if one were to suppose that the age-long tragedy of baffled and shattered nations turns upon nothing but a mistake in arithmetic.

The power to think and the power to feel are correlative; you cannot increase the one without increasing the other. And if men think obtusely and feel basely, it is not good for them that they should be driven to and fro between warm sentimentalism and cold logic. Such a regimen serves only to weaken the will and to slow the pulse both of thought and feeling.

What we need is to pull ourselves together. A man is sane and strong because of the reciprocity of his instinct and his intellect. And it is true as the Newtonian formula of gravitation that the energy of the will diminishes with the square of the distance between the emotional centre of a man's life and his brain-focus. Even so, a society is weak-willed and incompetent in the degree that its religion is diverse from its politics.

Now the university undertakes to heal the social disease by making idealism practical and business artistic. Its mission is to reintegrate the dissevered faculties of life. With one hand it grasps the things of science and with the other it lays hold of the humanities and the arts. It would create in every neighborhood a *milieu* of living romance, of enterprising love.

. . . . . .

It is related somewhere that a dozen young college men — at Harvard, or Yale perhaps — sat together in the afterglow of their commencement day, planning their generous careers. They would carry out into the world the spirit of the university — its realism, its idealism. They would not capitulate to the "mooners," nor yet to the "muckers." One was for law, another for medicine, another for trade, another was to be a newspaper man, and so on. They promised each other that they would return to the nourishing academic bosom on class day in ten years, and would make unglossed reports as to how their fine ambitions had really fared. The ten years slipped by, and then, as the story goes, they did indeed come back. But, alas! it was not as triumphant paladins and dragon-slayers. The university spirit, they confessed it, had gone clean out of them. They had

capitulated to the half-gods, one and all. The lawyer acknowledged with pangs that his enthusiasm for justice, his passion for "the perfection of human reason," had grown cold and documentary; he was attorney for a municipal gas company, and was too busy finding reasons to sustain its franchises. The physician, fronted by the reminders of his youthful faith, confessed with shame that he was no chevalier of immortal health, but only the pampered servant of rich and valetudinarian ladies. The trader had given up his ideas about lowering the labor-cost of the necessaries of life, and admitted that he thought of nothing in business hours save how to rule the market for his goods and acquire a taxing-power over the people that needed them. As for the newspaper man, he hastened to say with self-scorn that his paper was edited by the large advertisers of the department stores. And so it went on from apostate man to man, until the tale of twelve Judases was complete. A dozen shame-faced betrayers of civilization sat and looked out through their tobacco smoke over the quadrangle of the sacred Muses, and felt bitterly that they were no masters of arts at all — save apish, feline arts; that they had outraged science and the humanities. Thereupon, it is said, they drew pitifully near together in a gentle bond and communion of humiliation. And

then suddenly their hearts lightened. They arose up resolutely and said to one another: "We have not yet had *team-play!* Let us go out *together* and try again! It has been plainly shown that there is no one of us who is not too weak to go alone. Let us go together to some prairie town and build a house as a shrine of the nameless faith of science — something solid and visible to remind us, and to fix our wandering, feeble wills. And let us work and play in that town — bargain, print, plead and practice medicine — as children of the light and of the day; and see whether we may not do a stint or two for civilization. Or, if that be withholden from us, Heaven grant that we may at least lift the incubus of our sodden, expensive lives off the groaning Car."

VI

THE INSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLE

THE artistic-scientific spirit is at home in the United States; it actuates a million private lives. The late Prof. William James, of Harvard University, made a systematic exposition of the implications of this spirit — this attitude toward life. He called it philosophical Pragmatism, meaning about the same thing that has been described here as the original and essential spirit of the university. Call it by what name we will, this impatience of all religious and legal dogmas, this idealistic practicality, steadfastly determined to judge every tree by its fruits, every man by his ability to "deliver the goods," is the very genius of America, the esoteric religion and politics of its representative men. The trouble is that this spirit is too esoteric, too private and personal. What is lacking is the Institution of it, the organized and conscious togetherness of those who have been loosed from the bonds of religious and political superstition, whose minds are not bullied either by scripture or social tradition, and who

retain withal a lively faith, which they are ready to invest in civilizing enterprises.

If we are ruled by the money-power — *i. e.*, by a mind-weakening fear of hunger and commercial panic — it is not because the foolish are intrinsically stronger than the faithful, but because weak-mindedness is organized into solid phalanxes of class, sect, and party, while common sense is a mere good-natured crowd.

The social change that is impending cannot be accomplished by individuals acting in isolation — even though the sensible people were two-thirds of the population. Society is impossible without an overt and conscious meeting of minds — the establishment of a seat of authority. In the absence of an institution to nucleate the authority of art and science, it is impossible to escape from the rule of an irrational sovereignty. Social changes are massive. The isolated thinker is swept away by the surge of the great social tides. We exaggerate the osmotic power of fine ideas. The view-point of the university is insignificant, if not unintelligible, in the temples of priests and lawyers.

In the absence of an artistic-scientific polarity of social organization, the sway of an irrational and uneconomical state-sovereignty has always been unavoidable. There has followed, alike under many kinds of political constitutions, a social

struggle to get possession of the high seats of power. And this struggle has absorbed the best energies of men to the comparative neglect of the earth-wrestle, since it has been made more important to the prosperity of the individual that he should get on the right side of the law than that he should acquire productive efficiency.

Thus the two immemorial classes have arisen, the class above the law and that below it. But the struggle for political ascendency kills the goose that lays the golden egg; the social organism as a whole loses economic efficiency with the widening of the gap between the successful and the unsuccessful, and the consequent exacerbation of the class-struggle. Society as a whole grows poorer day by day — if not in bulk of commodities, yet in artistic and scientific competence, the ability to create real values — while at the same time the dominant class increases its accumulation of legally enforceable claims against the commonwealth. In this manner the vital social energy is turned against itself; bankruptcy supervenes, with moral prostration and a decomposition of the social tissues.

Sovereign states fall, but alas! only to rise again and repeat the heart-sickening process. And doubtless the process will be repeated again and again — as many times as may be necessary — until

the artistic-scientific spirit shall break into politics and sweep out of men's minds the superstitions of arbitrary and conventional law.

But this storming of the strongholds of political superstition cannot be accomplished by the literary mob — or by raw levies of educated men.

The university must become a militant order, a self-conscious and self-confident army.

The artistic-scientific spirit must open up its recruiting-stations. It needs a post-office address in every town.

VII

THE THREE GREAT VISIONS OF THE OLD WORLD

FOR a thousand years and more Christianity yeasted the world with the hope of a new order; and then there was born — out of the body of the Church — the University. The university of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was, as has been said, a political fact, a municipality. Thus for a moment, some centuries ago, the spirit of art and science did actually get into politics. It acquired a territorial jurisdiction and began to campaign for the possession of the earth. The universities of Oxford, Paris, Bologna, Salerno, were cities — civic associations for the nurture of art and science. The University stood between the Pope and the Emperor and skillfully played the one against the other, fighting for its own footing and the kingdom that was to come.

The Old World had three great visions of universal order. It dreamed first of a Roman Empire that should put the will of all mankind in the

service of pure intellect. Its law should be the perfection of human reason, and that law should execute itself from east to west and north to south by the arms of irresistible legions. For the Army is the Empire. It is not brute force — no thinker has ever thought of ruling the world by brute force — but the force of ordered and passionless intelligence, crushing down all personal affections and the rebellious motions of the heart. This was the Old World's earliest vision of universal order. It faded. The legions broke and were shattered against the indomitable instincts of humanity. In its grand sweep and compass men do not behold even in dreams this vision of the Empire any more. The pulse of imperialism is fitful and failing; and now at length the name is given to a sentimental provincialism marching behind the trade-signs of market-men and promoters. The dream of the Empire has come to nothing. The old Roman logic has been cancelled by the Master of History with a *non-sequitur*.

But when the dream of Cæsar first began to fade there arose another vision of universal order, still more magnificent — the dream of Augustine and Ambrose, of Hildebrand and Innocent. They dreamed of a Holy Catholic Church that should arise more terrible and glorious than armies, to beat down that tyranny of Intellect which had

bruised and broken the hearts of men, and win the whole world to the sway of suffering but imperious Love.

Shut your ecclesiastical chronicles and understand this thing — the Church of the dream of Hildebrand, the most magnificent failure in the human record to this date. For the inner meaning of it all is as plain as a homely household tale. The empire had laid out its flinty roads and deployed its legions by the book of geometry and arithmetic; it had mangled the heart of the universe under the wheels of its inflexible law and logic. The Church was the revolt of the Soul — exaggerated, monstrous, yet majestic in its balancing of the accounts of history. It condemned and executed the heartless Intellect for the age-long outrage that it had wrought upon human nature.

The Church of the Middle Ages was no man's invention — not Peter's nor Pope Gregory's. It would have come to pass in its essence, sooner or later, if Paul had never preached and if the focal point of the world-revolution had fallen not at Nazareth or Jerusalem, but somewhere else. The imperial Church was not of Christ — nor of anti-Christ. It was the recoil of the Empire. The Church's contempt for the intellect was, to be sure, no more valid than the Empire's contempt for the heart. And yet the mediæval Church was

as inevitable as the Western continent — to balance the Eastern. It was created from the reaction of human nature against the intolerable tyranny of cold reason. It was a splendid defiance flung in the teeth of formal logic, by the repressed emotion of the race.

The majestic fabric of mediæval Catholicism fell into ruins and its vision of universal order vanished away, because emotion without intellect is as impracticable as intellect without feeling — and has no more permanent a validity. The ecclesiastical system that had been built up to fight the insolence of "pure reason" — fire with fire — was good for that purpose, but it was not good for anything else. The builders of the militant Church did not know how to set the conquered Intellect soberly to work upon the earth in the service of the triumphant Soul. And so the fighting Church passed by, with its pageantry of spiritual pride — not, however, without leaving a witness in the world. For long before the vision of the universal Church had passed, a new vision of world-order had thrilled the hearts of seeing men. It is a light that has never failed since first it rose — the vision of a world-wide republic of art and science, the University.

It is a fact to be pondered that the Empire could not produce a genuine university. Under the sway

of the cold and abstract intellect there were grammar-schools and pedagogues a plenty; and immense knowledge-stores, such as the Musuem of Alexandria, stocked with an inexhaustible variety of information. But the spirit of the university — the spirit of buoyant and intrepid intellectual adventure — was nowhere to be found. The Empire could not have tolerated the university, because the university could not have tolerated the Empire. The university is by its constitution anti-militarist and democratic. To every Czar and Cæsar it is a hot-bed of sedition; for it acknowledges no master — save the master of arts.

To suppose that the university stands for the rule of pedants and dons, the rule of professional intellectuals, is a childish blunder — like supposing that cities are governed by policemen. Since the university contends for the emancipation of the intellect, it challenges all monopolies, especially that of the men who would sequestrate the key of knowledge. It proclaims the right of the spade and the bayonet to think — releasing the conscript and the clod-hopper from all authorities save those that are grounded in common sanity and the demands of civilization. The emancipation of the intellect breaks the spell of intellectualism.

In the beginnings of modern science, the Church fought hard against the arrogance of "pure rea-

son," and incidentally and through misunderstanding made life hard and death insistent for many true men of science, "humble men of heart"; but the Church was never the deliberate enemy of the "*practical reason*," the reason that expresses itself technologically and in the forms of art. On the contrary, the Church of the Middle Ages furnished the indispensable *milieu* for the gestation of the modern spirit. It was the placenta of modern science. For modern science in its characteristic mood is practical and utilitarian — the intellect is not permitted to lord it over humanity, but is made the meek handmaiden of civilizing industry. And this was also the characteristic mood of the church that built the cathedrals, housed the craft-guilds under their roofs, and covered Europe from the Mediterranean to the Baltic with free cities — the church that made its monks not only the curators of classic scholarship, but the conquerors of stubborn soils and pestiferous swamps.

There is no more significant word to mark the relationship of the university to the religious tradition of our race than that great saying of Anselm: "I believe, in order that I may understand." For it was impossible that the human spirit should ever become truly and practically scientific, that men should ever set their hands soberly to the

earth-subduing task until they had given up the attempt to think out a way to right living and had confidently settled down upon the earth to live and learn — believing in the unity and reasonableness of the universe, and in the malleability of all materials under "the hammers of the world-smiths." Anselm's aphorism is the right watch-word of the modern university and it contains the promise and potency of a sound industrial democracy. The sceptical and speculative intellect has always despised the laborer and clogged the wheels of industry. It is by keeping this fact in mind that one may best understand how it came to pass that the faithless and heart-contemning empire with all its boast of intellectualism weakened and depressed the creative mind, how the historic Church became the legitimate progenitor of the university, and how it is given to the university to fulfill the dream of universal order that to ecclesiastical Catholicism was only a dream.

The church becomes the university of the people; that is the conception that grips the antinomies of Catholicism and Protestantism and preserves to our thought the unbroken spiritual tradition of modern history. For what is Protestantism, with its "private judgment" and "justification by faith only," but an attempt to make faith consist with freedom of the mind — an attempt to turn the

church into a university of the people? Protestantism has failed simply because it has not been thorough-going. It is because it has flinched from the conclusion of its own logic that it has filled the world with jangling and impotent sects.

Protestantism has been humanly interesting and intelligible only when it has been frankly political — as in the rise of the Dutch Republic or the planting of the New England Colonies. That is to say, that it has been true to its own implications only when it has conceived of its bond of union as being, not dogmatic or sacramental, but territorial, the bond of fellow-citizenship. The only Protestantism that history can care much about stepped down out of the cathedral stalls in the days of the Reformation to lift in the market-place the standard of a new political order. And the only Protestantism that weighs an ounce in the scales of destiny is that which did not turn its back on the Catholic ideals of spiritual unity and territorial jurisdiction, but only girded itself with new confidence to carry them bravely out. In a word, it is too late to attempt to organize any kind of a religious society aloof and apart from the secular order; the time has come to make a burnt offering of all forms of ecclesiasticism and to apply the disciplined spirit of Christianity to the

task of organizing secular society itself — on a religious basis. *The Artistic-Scientific Republic is the true Church.*

The welter of moral and intellectual confusion through which we have passed in the last four hundred years has changed the meaning of many historic words. It has become impossible for the spiritual enterprise of our day to express itself in the one-time eloquent language of Christianity and the Church. If the Protestant Reformation had not on the whole miscarried, there is little doubt that " Church " would be the word that men would use to name the institution that must stand in every town and city ward as the primary organization of a government that is by the people and for the people. But the topsy-turvydom of sect has made it impossible to use that word — because it has acquired a meaning that is the contradictory opposite of what once it meant. It meant once the union of all minds; it means now the classification of men according to their speculative eccentricities. Since, then, it is impracticable to resume the original use of the word, why not let it go? The world is not to be saved by a word. The Church that spends itself in a mere blind protest against reason and science has nothing but a name to live; and why begrudge it that? It is dead. It has no mission in modern society. But the Church that

has patiently disciplined the intellect to the uses of humanity and art, the Church that is the nourishing mother of the university — can best carry its work forward to perfect victory under the university name.

VIII

THE RISE OF THE NEW CREATIVE ORDER

NEVER again on this planet will it be possible to organize society on a grand scale for any other purpose than for work. For unnumbered ages it has been possible to draw vast populations into an organization for praying or for fighting; but all that is passing or has passed. Small populations and parts of large ones — sects and parties — can still be got to submit to regimentation for these ends, but the power of such societies is failing with the fainting pulse of the old régime. A man with the modern breath in him hates the thought of an organization for the maintenance of fine theories and excellent states of mind. For these he will not pray any more nor fight any more. Social organization as it is being worked out in the United States is simply industrial organization. There is a religious motive, and a political method — but the soul of the organization is industrialism. This is the age of Business. Religion is the whip and spur and Politics is the bit and bridle, but Business is the horse and the

rider. Never again on this continent will the politician impose his elocutions and his diplomacies upon the man of business. It has become — since the events of the other day — quite as impossible that the industrial order should be ruled by professional statesmen as that it should be ruled by professional churchmen.

If the industrial system works at cross-purposes and grinds its own cogs — gives some more than they can spend and others less than they can live by — it is because the people hold back, afraid to commit themselves frankly to the new order of the world. They keep on paying the tax of Old World privilege because they fight against it with Old World weapons — the blunderbusses of professional politics and professional religion. Not half of us understand that a revolution has taken place — that we have just passed the poignant crisis of the revolution that began with the discovery of America and the earth-hunger of the Elizabethan age — and that society in this country rests now not upon political and religious formulas, but upon industrial and commercial ideas. Social organization, according to those that understand what has happened, consists now simply in getting men into their right places according to their competency and the requirements of the day's work. The conditions of the material problem determine the

form of the social organization. The exploitation of the universe is the game, and Nature yields not to wishes, but to work. The organization is for work, and the law and order of it is not to be deduced from tradition, not to be thought out in libraries nor fought out in struggles for abstract justice. It is a problem in fine art and engineering and is to be settled by the resources of human nature in face of the nature of things.

The old world of memory and dull prejudice, now passing to its rest, has exhausted its passion in the vain attempt to establish upon the earth the throne of justice and truth — leaving the world's work undone; a new order arises and girds itself for the work of civilization, without heart-ache or head-ache, confident that the inner truth and right of things may be safely left to its own self-vindicating power. It was David Strauss, the author of *Leben Jesu,* who first made the remark that morality consists in the relating of man to man, while religion consists in the relating of man to the universe. Accordingly, it may be said that in Europe social order is still a conventional arrangement and rests upon some well-settled moral theory; religion is merely called in to prop up the existing code of law — the State supports the Church as an aid to the police. But America, just because it makes no account of religious forms,

has a way with it that is essentially religious. More and more society in this country is going to depend for its unity, not upon the fixity of moral codes, but upon the sound relation of a lot of private persons to the constitution of the universe — the God of the open air. Morality — the manner of human relationships — in this new world is not the underpinning of social order, but the consummate flower of labor and love — the finest of the fine arts.

The old story goes that Phidias, who carved the frieze of the Parthenon, was regarded with some disdain by his contemporaries because, after all, he occupied himself as a stone-cutter when he might have been babbling philosophy and politics. The ancient man's disrespect for industry was due to his cosmic cowardice, his dread of tackling Nature with naked hands. The plain truth is that the Old World built its little states on moral platitudes and dyked them around to keep out the creative instincts and the elemental currents. Of course the tides of Nature, soon or late, flooded the narrow streets of the old cities and upheaved the foundations of fixed and formal law. The Babel-towers tumbled down because they were built on one settled theory or another of what the truth is, without regard to the changeful, flowing reality of the truth as it is actually dealt with by working-

men. The Old World is an in-door world; it is the mission of America to break the spell of its fatality by moving out into the sun and wind.

The Republic is not an organization for the protection of rights and the punishment of wrongs, any more than it is a missionary society for the propagation of the accredited creeds; it is a partnership of the people for the prosecution of the arts and sciences — an industrial combination for the building of cosmopolitan cities and the conduct of a world-commerce. Its laws are drawn not to reward good people and punish bad ones, but to defeat the folly of bunglers and release the energies of the efficient.

The social problem — the antagonism of classes — will exist here as elsewhere and will grow more and more acute so long as we persist in regarding the Republic as a State built on the Old World plan for dealing out abstract justice to rival claimants. The problem will be solved and the class antagonism will wear down when we accept the whole programme implied in the American Revolution and begin to see this unprecedented social order of ours in its true light as a business partnership for the pursuit of human happiness. This is the uniqueness of the democratic republic — the world-changing significance of our new-born Western society.

The class struggle, with all its loss and misery, is an inevitable fact so long as the political and religious organization of society is conceived of as a thing apart and aloof from the organization of industry. The real outcome of the historic struggle of the workers for a fair chance has been the gradual dissolution of purely political and purely religious society and the growing absorption of the political and religious interest of men in the development of the industrial order. Man, as the mere creature of God, the quintessence of dust, and the subject of laws, gives way to man as the improver of the creation — the master of materials and the maker of laws.

The industrial order is the kingdom of creative humanity, and it is going to solve the social problem by making laws for economizing the repressed creative forces of the people without much regard to theoretical or customary rights: democracy, liberty, equality, fraternity, are only fine names so long as a man's legal rights determine what he can do; they become the life of the law as soon as what a man can do determines his legal rights.

The gap between capitalism and laborism can never be closed by purely political devices. There is no way of organizing political society apart from industrial society that will not at last produce a ruling class and a ruled class — masters and slaves

— a stationary order and the death of enterprise. One set of people will be legally empowered to do what they are naturally incompetent to do, and another set will be legally disqualified for doing their natural work. If the millionaire senators, metropolitan bishops, money-magnates, labor-marshals, sociological experts, prophets of Paradise, and so on — were to agree together upon a definition of righteousness and frame it into a perfect political system, the world of enterprise would hate their righteousness and repudiate their system within a week. In an industrial society the right of things must work in a sliding scale, according to the exigencies of the business in hand. It never can be fixed and settled by moralists.

It is in the course of our adventures into more intimate relations with the Soul of the Cosmos that we are to open up the sealed orders of democratic justice. There is no dissolving of any of our economic doubts so long as the question of property is posed in the old unworldly way — as if the question were: Which of the litigants has the diviner right to quit work and retire into a heaven of rumination and rest? We shall solve the social question fast enough when we begin to ask the right question. The question of property must be stated as a problem of industrial expediency: Which of all the proposed measures will best avail

to put tools into the hands that can use them, and release to the maximum the creative faculties of men? That is the right question, and there is always a workable solution. But the solution is never final. There is no finished formula for the working of a farm.

This idea of organizing society on one plane for the maintenance of rights, and then organizing it again on another and lower plane for the doing of work, is an idea that can hold its own only where industry is unsystematic and labor is despised, only where the conception of the spiritual conquest of the material world has not yet risen to be — as it is coming to be in America — the romance and passion of the people. Democracy as a mere political programme has had results that are mainly negative. Moving in the sphere of politics, as distinct from that of industry, democracy has not solved the social problem, and cannot. It cannot release the creative faculties of the people from the ancient thralldom of authoritarian law. Yet it has done the world a service: it has discredited the political superstition — has proved that a progressive society can not be ordered on the metaphysical ground of abstract right. Just so Protestantism, with all its vagaries, has destroyed the ecclesiastical superstition — proved the inapplicability of any miraculous revelation as a pattern for social order.

Political democracy, like Protestantism, is seen to be an impossible and transitional phase of existence, a state of unstable equilibrium. It calls in question the sovereignty of princes and presidents, but it is incapable of establishing the sovereignty of the people — except in a documentary sense. Democracy comes to itself only when it gives up the attempt to create a political organization apart from the industrial order — just as Protestantism realizes its own implications of moral and intellectual liberty only when it stops trying to organize a church apart from the secular world. The parties and sects that have come out of political democracy and Protestantism are the lees and dregs of the old régime: its wine is in the veins of the working world.

When the population of the United States was small and our industrial order an orbless nebula, it seemed possible to keep the political order separated from industry, but parallel in its development. It was supposed for a moment that the New World had invented political machinery that could work changes in the law as fast as the industrial machinery could work changes in the conditions of existence. But it has been demonstrated in the last quarter-century that Metaphysical Politics and Intensive Industry are nags that can not be coaxed to travel in double harness. If one

grows blithe and mettlesome, the other goes lame. There remains no question now as to which, on the whole, is the sounder animal and longer for this world.

The scholars in politics have had their day and ceased. The paralysis of ideal politics has become the settled and successful policy of business. The industrials contrive somehow that nothing political shall be done. And the most that a politician can do in these days is to hold up their wheels on the road for a moment — by the threat of doing something. It is not the total depravity of trust-makers that has sapped the vigor of the political system — that is a pious prejudice. The truth is that the political system had no vigor. The virtue of the age had gone out of it.

For two full generations the tenser life of the American people has been given to industry — in contempt of politics. It is the instinct of efficiency to despise the mock heroics and cumbersome indirection of political reform. Nobody with a talent for accomplishing things can spend his time in persuading a multitude of people to think alike. There is a shorter way of changing the laws than by talk. It is discovered that every stroke of effectual industry changes the nature of man and the conditions of earthly existence — and that changes the laws. If our super-mundane political system now

makes for the interest of plutocracy — the infernal reign of Plutus — that is because it is a dead body. And a dead politics in the house is as dangerous to health as a dead religion.

The genius of this land is industry — the regenerative life of the world. With the discrediting of sects and parties it became possible for the people to get together in the spirit of the arts and sciences, for the work of civilization. It becomes possible to set up the true standard of the university and to build the free city.

Of course the spirit of the arts and sciences is the same thing as the spirit of industry. For the spirit of industry is more than the bulk of commodities; it is the victorious heart of humanity in wrestle with the resistent conditions of life. A child may have a part in it. A serene old woman on her dying-bed may do more for the building of the free city than fifty navies with swinging mattocks.

The university is the church of the industrial republic — the spiritual organization of the people for adventurous enterprise. Its standard is the original and final creed of humanity — the faith that the human spirit is at home here; that the things of science are framed for the works of art; that the hardest materials of nature are plastic under the hand of an indomitable ideal.

When Abelard left the cloister and went out alone into the Champagne country, followed in his exile by ten thousand men, who built their huts around his shack in the wilderness, to share the life of one who could face Nature with a naked mind, a thing had happened that had more to do with the rise of the industrial republic of the West than Magna Charta or Martin Luther.

IX

THE RISE OF FREE CITIES UNDER THE NEW ORDER

A FREE city is a city that rules a sufficient area of land to support its population — under a law framed with a single eye to the advancement of science and the humanities.

Such a city as this has been the goal of the aspirations of wise men through all the ages of civilization. But the thing has never yet been realized in any settled way. The most thrilling and commanding passages of history are those in which the free city has come near being realized for a moment. All seeing men have understood that such an achievement is perfectly possible, have seen indeed that it is quite impossible to build a city that shall be permanent, on any other basis. But the mass of us have always up to this time preferred to be slaves — and tyrants. We have never respected ourselves enough to be free. And we have never been in spirit artistic and scientific enough to build a free city — a city of the open air so masterfully true to nature that its palaces should never be given to the bats and owls.

In the ancient world this great drama of disappointment was played out principally on three stages: at Jerusalem, at Athens, and at Rome. The blood leaps even now at all these names — because each of these cities in turn came so near being free. But the waves of time swept over them all and they all became memories and the haunts of tourists, because they were not content to rest upon the principles of nature, but tried to lord it over other towns. One might say that Jerusalem failed because of its spiritual tyranny, Athens because of its sentimental top-loftiness, and Rome because of its sheer intellectual insolence. Anyhow, they all went wrong because they tried to rule the world and to set it in order on principles that were other than artistic and scientific. The Jerusalem which is "free and the mother of us all" has not yet been built in Palestine. The "shining, violet-crowned city of song" of which Pindar sang — that "August Athenæ" of Pericles — now hires a king from western Europe. And the City of the Seven Hills is a cemetery of lost causes that deserved to be lost.

But the idea of the free city is more sure of itself than ever. There is a great momentum gathering behind it through all the disasters of the past.

For a moment in recent history men have con-

cerned themselves much with vast political contrivances — but we shall never escape for long from the love of the city. The statesmen and lawyers have had their little day, have held the centre of the stage for a while unfolding to us their intricate devices — their day-dreams of sovereign states and empires. But states and empires are pure abstractions unless the city is behind them. They are not real and tangible, they have only a documentary existence. The city is the real thing. Nobody ever saw with the naked eye a state or an empire; and if all such things were abolished in a night, one might not miss them in his daily walk. But the city is a part of the ground-plan of nature, as much as a bee-hive or a beavers' dam. It exists to "fulfill the desire of the mute earth." It is the consummate work of art; and "art" — it was Aristotle who said it first — "is the very nature of man."

Dr. Edward Everett Hale said that within a generation or so population is going to be vastly diffused and everybody is going to live in a green field and have a garden-patch. All this may indeed come to pass through improvements in the means of rapid locomotion. For a city can be a city without being crowded — and in fact can never be free or fine so long as it *is* crowded.

To-day you can ride nearly an hour on an ex-

press train from the outer limits of Chicago to Polk Street Station; and in the near future it is likely that all American cities will be as big as counties. The time-worn antithesis of city and country will soon cease to have a meaning. The city will have forests and farms in it, and *rus in urbe* will be the general rule. "Uncle Reuben" will pass away and become a tradition on the same day with the "Yellow Kid." There will be no back-country and no seething slum. Earth-commanding municipalities will cover the whole land.

The essential thing about a city is not density of population, but a social unity embodying and expressing itself in the forms of art. Nothing but the destruction of civilization and a reversion to barbarism can stop the tendency of society to nucleate in cities. And the dream of a social State of undifferentiated protoplasm — the people spread out thin and even across a continent — is not likely to be realized.

A myriad of human habitations grouped around a forum or market-place and surrounded by a considerable area of open country — this is the germ-cell and unit of civilization, the permanent physical phenomenon of the city. It is older than the earliest records and no social revolution or convulsion of nature is likely to do away with it.

On the contrary, all the deeper currents of modern times tend to give it peculiar emphasis.

There is indeed a superficial tendency running the other way — the "ripper bill" tendency, which derives its strength from the theory still rife among us that people who live on farms or in little villages are purer and better than those who live in large towns. The men who run the state machines and boss the legislatures know all too well how to make capital out of these old superstitions, and the civic abominations as they actually exist are largely due to the fact that the great cities are governed by farmers and country lawyers assembled at Albany, Harrisburg, Columbus and elsewhere, to manage things too high for their understanding.

The truth is, that city life is, in the nature of things, a higher kind of life than country life, and to live it well requires that one should be more human. The problems of the city cannot be solved in the back country or "up the state" any more than the problems of a grown man can be solved by a boy — or the problems of a fish by an oyster.

The word "pagan" means, as every Latin-school boy knows, a dweller in a little village. The spiritual quickening which went through the world in the early ages of this era was felt most

in great cities; and to be a villager came to mean the same thing as to be a narrow-minded, superstitious person clinging to the knees of the old idols.

The notion that cities need to have a great imperial power set over them to make and keep them good is a purely pagan notion. It is supposed by the pagans that still live on belated in these times that the only way to maintain order throughout the land is to get all the respectable people to profess unquestioning obedience to a mystic oracle or Mumbo-Jumbo called the Sovereignty of the Nation. There is no use arguing with people who think like that. Nothing but events can deal with them.

It is the rise of the vast and sensitive system of modern industry that is convincing the pagan that his god is a wood pulp god and hears not; that the god of law and order is not to be worshipped in documents or legal theories.

Industrialism is bound to free the cities from the over-lordship of state legislatures and the national military power, because the development of industrialism is making it plain that social order — a vigorous and progressive social unity — can be maintained on the grandest scale, throughout a continent and the whole world, without resort to the ghost realm of arbitrary authority. It is

being discovered in this tremendous earth-wrestle of modern business that there is enough morality in the very nature of things to hold the American people together — without the help of high priests or the hired devotions of the regular Army.

The point is that when ninety million people set out to do work together — improve the universe, dam its floods, dampen its droughts, cut its isthmuses, and so on — when a vast population, spread over a continent, comes to care more for business than for anything else, then a new and unprecedented thing happens. It is discovered that a modern city, in becoming a part of a great industrial system, is so completely bound by the very nature of things to keep the peace and act decently toward all her neighbors, that there is really no need of a good emperor or a good president to wield the impartial sword of sovereign law and drive bad cities into line.

When, for example, Mr. Grover Cleveland sent the United States troops to Chicago to quell a riot which was supposed to be impeding the mails, he meant entirely well, no doubt. But he acted like a man out of a book or one from the country. He seemed not to be aware that the industrial age had dawned; that in this new day every city is bound to every other and to the whole industrial order in such sensitive bonds of com-

merce and credit that it cannot live without wide social peace and correspondence with the rest of the world.

In the age of the Cæsars a legion was indeed the logical medicine for a disorder in a city of Gaul; but in the age of Cleveland it would have sufficed to send the mails for a day or two around by Peoria and Milwaukee without stopping at Chicago. Granted that there really was a dangerous mob in Chicago on that occasion, Chicago would have risen up and subdued it in an afternoon, if only Chicago had been well assured, as it should have been, that it must depend completely upon itself; and that the rest of the country would continue to deal with it only so long as it played the regular game.

At the end of a day of successful mob rule under such conditions, every dollar of permanent investment in Chicago would have been worth not more than seventy-five cents; and at the end of a week of anarchy the youth of the world would have flocked to Chicago to make its fortune by buying good real estate for a song and putting value into it by vigilance committee.

Really, it is too late for Cæsar and the old village ways; this is the day of industrial law — the day of the revelation of the irresistible morality that exists in the nature of things.

X

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY TOWNS

LET us give a page or two to recapitulation in order to remind ourselves of the steps of the argument that discloses the university as the soul of the free city — before we pass to consider a practical plan for the creation of national university towns.

For thousands of years before the beginnings of Christianity nothing considerable had been done to raise the general standard of living or make the average man more at home in the world, and for more than a thousand years afterward the results in this line were so meagre as to be nearly negligible.

The disease from which the world suffered may, as has been said, be described as a morbid breach between the intellect and the emotions. The ancients had just as good heads as modern men — and just as good hearts. There is no reason to suppose that the brains of our great men are any heavier than those of the Pharaohs, or their sentiments any finer. The trouble with the Old World

was simply that its intellect and its emotions had been divorced from each other. Its knowing-power was not on speaking terms with its motive-power.

Emotion is the driving-force of life and intellect is the steering apparatus. Emotion does all the work that is done in this world, but without intellect it is a tread-mill round — there is no progress in it. On the other hand, thinking that is not touched with emotion, that is devoid of the passion of ideals, is mere logic-chopping or empty speculation. It has no power to move any man's hands. Because of this "original sin," therefore, this hereditary schism between the intellect and the emotions, the human race lost the power to do intelligent work and social order fell into an endless class-struggle.

It was the most striking consequence of this disaster that for five thousand years nobody ever clearly thought of such a thing as a social organization for the advancement of the arts and sciences. It was the Church that paved the difficult way to that idea by insistence that the God within a man and the God of the universe are one and the same God. This was as much as to say that the law of the heart can come to terms with the law of the head, and that the arts and the sciences are two sides of the same thing — and must stick together.

So it came to pass in due time that the university was born out of the cathedral schools. But the university was much more than a school. A university was a free city, jealously guarding its rights against all adverse claims of the Pope and the Emperor and striving to win a foothold upon the solid ground for a new kind of social order. The world had had more than enough of the rule of kings and more than enough of the rule of crowds; the time had come to make a beginning of a new kind of government — a government by the Masters of Materials — in academic phrase, Masters of Arts. That is certainly the kind of government that the future has in store for us. It will give a final quietus to our political bewilderment, for when it shall be fairly established it can never be overthrown. The force by which governments subsist is derived from the elemental forces of nature. All the forms of government of which we have had experience are unstable because in them the force which the law undertakes to consecrate does not coincide with the force that men derive from nature. But when government gets into the hands of those who have acquired mastery of the natural forces and know how to use them in the service of all, such a government will be permanent and endlessly progressive. It will be irresistible, both because it will have in its own

STANFORD LIBRARY

hands the energies that now furnish the driving power of revolutions, and because it will command the moral assent of the people by constantly serving them. It will fulfill the definition both of a real democracy and a genuine aristocracy.

Of course the universities of the Middle Ages did not realize to the full the civic conceptions that were implied in their charters. They left that for us to do. They were clogged with all the morbid traditions of the past. They made a tremendous effort to bring the scientific spirit into effectual correspondence with the humanistic spirit, to heal the immemorial breach between the intellect and the emotional forces of life; but the confused currents of the time were too strong for them, and the utmost that they could accomplish was to rough-sketch the design of a true civic order and leave it for the future to work out. The prophetic idea that we derive from them is the idea of *a city with laws framed for the advancement of the arts and sciences, a city dominated by artistic and scientific experts.*

Now the advancement of the arts and sciences means simply the bringing of human nature into more agreeable relations with the nature of things. Stated in the language of economics, this means raising the general standard of living. It means increasing the purchasing power of an average

YALE LIBRARY

day's work. It means raising wages and lowering prices.

The astonishing thing about our industrial order as it exists is that there is as yet nowhere to be found in the modern world such a thing as a corporation devoted to the increase of material well-being! There is nowhere a corporation organized and worked to better the physical standard of living. This is the grand oversight of modern civilization and the most damnatory indictment against our industrial order. How incredible it will sound to those of our posterity who shall endeavor to find grounds of admiration for the past! The nineteenth century — they will be told — supposed itself to be the age of social organization for the production of wealth, yet in that age the vast wealth that was produced was all *in spite* of the social organization; for the law left the initiative and control of industry wholly in the hands of those whose sole credential was the possession of stocks, bonds, and other certificates of indebtedness, and the sole aim of whose enterprise was to raise prices and lower wages in order that interest and profits might be increased. They will be told that in that century the idea of doing business for the sake of raising the standard of living was regarded as purely sentimental. In a word, posterity will discover that in the age which has just

passed the intellectual forces of life were as completely, as morbidly divorced from the emotional forces as in any of the darkest and sickest periods of history.

Time was that men here and there were more capable than they are to-day of assessing the value of a sound theory — of seeing, in advance of a demonstration, the force of a general truth. We have nearly lost the power of abstract thinking; witness the decadence of theology, whether "new" or "old," and the driving out of business of all those who seriously undertake to help the people to a coherent philosophy of life. Our pragmatical contemporaries are mostly "from Missouri" and must be "shown." It might have been enough, if the general psychological conditions were different, to go abroad preaching the gospel of the university, trusting the feeling mind and the understanding heart to discover the stupidity and cruelty of the social theory that we are trying to live by, and to establish in every existing town and city ward an institution that should embody the regenerative university idea — an institution that should supersede the existing religious sects and political parties by an organization of the people in the spirit of the university; and that should replace the chaotic misrule of professional goodmen and professional smart-men by a government

of those effectual civilizers and masters of arts who had proved their capacity to serve. Certainly there is a fighting chance to make over the old cities on this new plan by sheer force of logic and common sense in spite of our epidemic myopia of the abstract intellect. But as things stand the best way to give currency to the true university idea is *to go out into the bare places and build a few university cities from the ground up, as samples.*

A city is substantially "free" when its economic life is not dominated by any power outside its own civic organization. To this end a municipal government ought to have primary jurisdiction over a sufficient area of land to support its population. The proposition, therefore, is to build university towns, universities whose charters shall be municipal charters, and set them the task of subduing as much of the earth as they can manage — say a million or two acres each, something over forty miles square — by the exercise of their own organic civilizing powers.

The university, once in possession of its land and "plant," should be self-sustaining. It should also be very much more than self-sustaining; it should by its own creative energies furnish the highest artistic and scientific conditions of social existence now anywhere extant. A day's work should buy more there than elsewhere; thus there

would be set up a rousing inter-municipal competition which would compel all neighboring cities to civilize themselves — on pain of the loss of population and the decline of real estate. For the city which can maintain a higher rate of wages and a lower cost of living than its competitors must perforce become the capital of the world. Nobody knows how high the organized artistic and scientific enterprise of a city can drive wages, or how low it can drive prices — *because no city has ever tried.*

American universities as they exist are the almshouses of the arts and sciences. The creative intellect is pauperized in them and made the parasite of the artless, scienceless drudges of the field and workshop. For example, the University of Texas is endowed with about two million acres of land. Can it subdue this principally to the uses of the human ideal? Are the masters of arts in the Texas university showing the 'prentice hands how to make civility and grace and fair dwellings and laughing waters come up out of the sagebrush plains? Not at all. The lands are rackrented for seventy thousand dollars to unregenerate ranchmen and mechanics; and with that sum and whatever else can be begged from the legislature or anybody else, a large number of book-men and boys are supported in a state of boredom tempered by foot-

ball, in order that the toilers of Texas may nurse the illusion that they have some vicarious part and lot in the wide humanities. It is the same nearly everywhere, of course; but the pathos of it seems somehow especially poignant in Texas.

America is threatened with a deadly class-struggle between the money-power and the mob. The former is the power of science working in abstraction from the humanities; the latter is the energy of the humanities driven blindly without science. *To take sides in this struggle is to lose your vote.* Both sides are sure to be beaten and would lose most in winning. There is still in this country a whole-souled contingent that is neither proletarian nor plutocratic. What it lacks is organization and a programme. Here is the making of a prevailing political movement. A part of the programme of this movement should be *the creation of national university towns on the public lands, with a view to bringing the whole fabric of government into harmony with the principles that the humanities should prevail over the money-power, and scientific efficiency over the crowd.*

In February, 1911, a bill was introduced in the Senate by Mr. Borah for the establishment of a United States University. It should be, not a socially parasitic academy after the manner of the universities with which we are already too familiar,

but *a self-sustaining municipality* with political jurisdiction over a new and larger District of Columbia on the right bank of the Potomac.

The national Government is building the Panama Canal and schoolmastering the Filipinos. No violence will be done to constitutional precedent if now that Government shall undertake to establish a genuine university in Virginia — or on the desert lands of the West.

The desert lands are the best lands in the country; but they mock at private initiative and the freebooting money-maker. That is a providential fact. These lands have been reserved, without human foresight, for great adventures in corporate civilization.

We need to be reminded, perhaps, that the famous cities of the antique world were for the most part founded upon the practice of irrigation and nursed in the desert. That Old World was scientific enough to prefer its rainless lands — Egypt and Palestine — Asia Minor and Syria, the land of the Carthaginians and the Moors, of the Incas and the Aztecs. The simple fact seems to be that the soluble plant foods — potash, lime, magnesia, sulphuric acid and so on — are, in countries of abundant rainfall, mainly washed away and wasted; while in arid countries these elements accumulate in the soil an inexhaustible bank account

to be drawn on, without possibility of protest — through irrigation ditches. There is expert testimony to the effect that "the soils that lie west of the hundredth meridian in the United States, as compared with those that lie east of the Mississippi, contain on the average about three times as much potash, six times as much magnesia, and fourteen times as much lime."

So the new university cities of the "Great American Desert" would have solid elemental underpinning.

In a few years — perhaps a few months — New York, Philadelphia and the other great cities of the East may be suffering from an appalling problem of the unemployed. Under existing economic arrangements, the convulsions that are called commercial crises, with their attendant phenomena of "over-production" and failure of credit, are periodic and unavoidable. For, as things stand, mercantile credit is based, not upon technological or value-producing ability, but upon ability to collect debts. And since our "prosperity" consists very largely in the increasing of the legally enforceable claims of the creditor class, every period of commercial expansion is bound to end soon or late in such an accumulation of bad debts and indigestible securities as shakes everybody's confidence in the bill-collector. The crisis is there-

fore a part of the system and may be counted on.

Before the next paroxysm of national heart-failure our party of university propaganda should have braced the public mind with its definite programme for the alleviation of the social distress. It should demand at once that the Government, on the completion of the immense irrigation projects in Arizona, in Colorado, in Idaho, and elsewhere, shall not try to peddle out the redeemed lands to wandering "home-seekers," but that they shall be kept in bulk and, together with such adjacent public lands as may be available, shall be made — like the District of Columbia — the sites of national cities. The demand should be made that the charters of these cities should be framed after the manner of university charters — establishing self-perpetuating faculties or governing corporations, with powers larger indeed than those of the commissioners who manage the civic affairs of the national capital city, but no different in principle.

The new university corporations should include all the Burnhams, McAdoos, Pinchots, and Olmsteads, the General Woods and Colonel Roosevelts that might by any means be got to serve — not forgetting such specialists as Professor Hilgard and Mr. Luther Burbank, of California, Mr. Elwood Mead, who drew up the irrigation law

code of Wyoming, which has been the working-model in that line of all the other far western States, and Mr. William E. Smythe, who wrote that luminous and prophetic book, "The Conquest of Arid America."

When we shall have put in full charge of the several land-tracts corporations composed after this manner, and shall have alloted to each concern a few millions of dollars from the national treasury as a momentum-fund, the country should say to them: "Go ahead. Build cities in the university spirit and teach by demonstration how the arts and sciences may be advanced. We believe in you; we fetter you with no fine theories of the rights of man; you are under no law but that of the federal courts and the constitution of the universe. Go on and clear spaces in which fine goods shall be cheaper than they are in New York and common men dearer. If Shontz or Stevens or the Army engineers can scoop down the mountains at the Isthmus, you also can level a few lifts."

The immediate effect upon an era of commercial depression of an enterprise of this sort may be expected to be as stimulating as a first-class foreign war; the ultimate effect would be strikingly different, since, instead of getting the mass of the people into debt, it would get them out of it, and

instead of destroying wealth on a vast scale, it would create wealth on a scale as vast. The effect would be as if half a score of World's Fair cities were to be built in a single year — only these should be cities that could pay their own freight; and instead of crumbling into tinsel and plaster at the end of a gaudy show, they might be quite as permanent as anything earthly, and stand — fair as the city of Damascus in the midst of its palm gardens and flashing streams — when most that is now called American had passed to its day of judgment.

In these establishments the guide-lines of practical administration should be derived from the lineaments of the university — in its original and normal idea. The university is at bottom religious; it has a gospel that preaches the unity and reasonableness of the ground-plan of the world. It is actuated by a faith that the laws of science are framed to match the laws of art — that all material things are plastic under the hand of an insistent ideal. Thus the university as a physical institution should be to the new towns what the cathedral was to the mediæval cities of Europe.

The university in its true character offers promotion and an expanding career on one single condition — to wit: the achievement of some kind of value-producing efficiency. Its organization,

therefore, should develop an ascending scale of ranks in which one might hope to become more commanding only by becoming more serviceable. The servants should rule. They should not merely be permitted to serve; they have an authoritative and indefeasible right to rule.

The men who know how to bring human nature into fruitful and victorious relations with the nature of things are an authentic democratic aristocracy, and must not, if they can help it, permit themselves to be overruled by mere numbers. This is a social principle that lies in the very marrow of the university ideal. It antagonizes our hereditary political prejudices, to be sure; yet not it, but they, must eventually give way. The principle in fine is this: *In a sound industrial society the higher rank should elect the lower, not the lower the higher.* The track-walker should not elect the section-boss, but contrariwise. Only the efficient are qualified to judge of a candidate's efficiency. The violation of this principle seems to be the cause of the failure of most so-called co-operative experiments. It is the radical flaw in the proletarian programme of "scientific socialism." It would seem safe to say that American city-making can never become artistic and scientific so long as we cleave to the tradition of the sovereignty of majorities; and that the reason why the city of Wash-

ington is so incomparably better governed than any other city in the United States is that it is the only city in the country that is not governed by plebiscite. Majority-rule has indeed a revolutionary value; it is the only possible counterpoise to the tyranny of entrenched incompetents. But when once a society has found its equilibrium in a sound industrial order, it seems to be certain that the rule of kings and the rule of crowds must fall into contempt together. Yet, the whole exemplary value of these new adventures would depend upon their being locally self-governed; their corporations, once established, should have unrestricted power to recruit themselves from their own citizenship.

There is a prospect that pure science would receive an unprecedented impetus from universities of this new type. It is certainly a mistake to suppose that science in its larger and more speculative scope is best advanced when laboratory work and original research are carried on in a subsidized social vacuum and in utter aloofness from practical affairs. The whole history of scientific progress points in an opposite direction, and goes to show that the largest accessions of knowledge and a true scientific philosophy are likely to come from a university that is enmeshed in an industrial order and whose atmosphere is aflame with

a passion for social progress. Why is it that the scientific method burgeoned for a brilliant season in Athens, in Alexandria, and in Syracuse — and then died for a thousand years? It was because Aristotle and Galen and Hipparchus and Ptolemy and Archimedes despised economics and the social problem and disdained to apply their science to the material enrichment of the world; and because the society in which they lived was utterly devoid of an industrial organization that could economize scientific ideas.

Plutarch tells how King Hiero entreated Archimedes almost, though not quite, in vain, "to turn his art from abstracted notions to matters of sense, and to make his reasonings more intelligible to the generality of mankind by applying them to the uses of common life." And he says also that Plato inveighed against Eudoxus and Archytas, who made some feeble efforts to translate their geometry into terms of mechanics, "inveighed against them with great indignation, as corrupting the excellence of geometry by making her descend from incorporeal and intellectual to corporeal and sensible things." If there are savants nowadays that could not interest themselves in such universities as are proposed, they belong by moral consanguinity, not to this age, but to that of Plato. The representative scientists of to-day are also masters

of creative arts — men of the stamp of Lord Kelvin and Thomas Edison, who have made electricity a familiar tool; Pasteur, who left his laboratory to destroy hog-cholera and cattle-plague; and the late Professor Bertellot, who managed an experimental farm in the environs of Paris. Possibly our national universities might furnish for the work of such men the best *milieu* that can be imagined.

The president of the Territorial University of Arizona, at Tucson, was asked why athletics do not flourish in that institution. He said: "The faculty here have gone in for the regular sports that are in vogue in Eastern colleges, and have tried to interest the students in that sort of thing. But it is no use; the boys have absorbed their minds in a bigger game than foot-ball, the game of besting this desert here with the tools of science. And they are away every holiday with the engineers and irrigators — to the bottoms of mines and the tops of mountains — training for the Match."

So it would seem that the city-building university idea, which has lain so long in the ground, has already sprouted.

XI

THE SPIRITUAL INTEGRATION OF THE NEW INDUSTRIAL ORDER

THE building of free university towns in the manner suggested in the last chapter is, of course, not indispensable to the new order of things; there are other ways. Whether by national *coup de main* or by slower interior processes of municipal regeneration, the new social ideal must before long get itself an embodiment. Our industrial society must somehow achieve its unity and integrity. The modern free city must nucleate its creative and earth-conquering life in a university of the people that shall be as inclusive of all ideal interests as was the cathedral church in the free cities of the Middle Age.

It was said by the Italian Manzoni that when democracy shall become a religion, it will transform the face of the world. We in America have always understood that there is something in the genius of this Western land that is not contained in political contrivances or to be accounted for in

secular terms; that America has some sort of a regenerative mission to the whole world. But our conception of these things has not been precise.

Certainly we have been sure that the faith that lies unuttered in the soul of the Nation is not a sectarian religion. And the course of contemporary history in England, in France, in Spain and Portugal, and throughout the world fortifies us in the persuasion that professional religion of whatever kind is doomed to die. But does this mean that the real faith of men is weakening, that idealism is passing as a dream and that the universal heart is growing cold? No. The fact is that the ecclesiastical establishments are not religious enough to contain the man of the modern spirit.

Religion is at bottom the feeling of the overwhelming potency of what is right. It is the conviction that the ideal is practical, and that nothing else is. The spiritual enfeeblement of the churches follows from the fact that they have withdrawn from the earth-struggle.

It is said that men stop going to church when they cease to be afraid of hell. The statement is hardly accurate; for men can never cease to fear that which is the opposite of their hope, can never cease to be afraid of a hell of some sort — a real and terrible perdition. Thomas Carlyle had it in his day that the hell that was really dreaded was

that of "not making money." Certainly it was a dreadful thing to fall into the abyss of poverty in his Manchester mills or East London. Yet it is possible that Carlyle never quite understood the real passion and terror of his contemporaries; he lived too much in his study and in the past. The fear that had really begun to lurk at the bottom of men's hearts in those days of the rise of modern industrialism in England and America was not wholly a fear of not making money; it was partly a fear of not "making good." The ideal forces of the world had suddenly been turned from the pursuit of religious and political abstractions to the concrete problems of economic production. For the first time in history men began to prosecute their material business with a crusading zeal. And from that day to this a new kind of hell has been enlarging its borders — *the hell of being of no use to the universe, and therefore doomed to pass out of existence.*

The representative sort of modern men cannot believe in unconditional immortality — or in any thing else unconditional. It is perceived that everything stands through its relations with everything else. It follows that *if a man would live an endless life, he must inextricably implicate himself in the world's affairs. Mental abstraction is the shadow of death and self-absorption is progressive*

annihilation. Such, at all events, is the conviction that is settling in the modern heart. It is this persuasion that is destroying the leisure class. Men are compelled " to leap from their seats and contend for their lives." The moral law — the law that one must function well in society — is seen to be self-vindicating; you must respect it or it will kill you.

How lax and negligible are the casuistries of the old creeds — tugging at dull consciences with a cord two thousand years long — in comparison with this tremendous truth of the modern consciousness, pressing upon us like an atmosphere — fifteen pounds to the square inch!

Not to " make good " is hell. And what do we mean by " making good "? That it is a different thing from making money is evidenced by the cyclone of social disapproval that is now circling about the heads of the conspicuously rich. Certainly it is the judgment of their contemporaries that *they* have not " delivered the goods " at least, not in bulk and quality to match their talents and opportunities. The complaint against them is that they have not implicated their own interests in those of the commonwealth — that they have been self-absorbed.

To do something that helps to make life more livable upon the earth, to lend a hand in the Titanic

struggle of the race — its striving to make the human spirit at home in the real world — that is already the esoteric aim of American business; and the day has come when this secret doctrine must be spoken aloud. The idea of public-spiritedness as a grace to be achieved after office hours is a tradition of our fathers which we have decided to discontinue. Frock-coated philanthropy is nearly a thing of the past. The religion of democracy — the religion of sensible men — knows not how to run a knife-blade between its egotism and its altruism, its realism and its idealism; they are inextricably mixed together. What we want is life, and more abundant life; and we know that we can get it only by playing fair and friendly at the world's great game. Can there be any doubt that there soon must rise a temple of this nameless faith?

Social unity depends upon the general agreement of the most forceful people as to what is the criterion of right. A society can move and act with clearness only when there is a fair consensus of its members in their moral ideal. Modern society staggers and wastes itself because it has not yet achieved this consensus. Broadly speaking, the irreconcilable moralities that distract us and tear our social tissue are just three. For the sake of simplicity, let us call these three codes respectively

the morality of the priest, the morality of the politician, and the morality of the engineer. These three types are ethically unintelligible to one another; they use the word "right" in totally different senses. To the professional religious person "right" always has an accent of self-denial; "to do right" means to do something that is more or less offensive to taste and instinct, something that is disagreeable to do. To the professional political person, on the other hand, "right" is synonymous with self-assertion; a man's political rights are his claims and pretensions. But the morality of the engineer (the typical man of the new industrial order) is contemptuous both of self-denials and self-assertions. It is purely objective. An engineer figures out, for example, the stress to which a girder is to be subjected, and if it will stand the strain, he says, "I have got it right!" Now this morality of the engineer is simply the spiritual principle of art and science; it fits a man to be not only an engineer, but also an artist and a gentleman — which the two contrasting moralities do not. The true solution of the ethical problem is that a man should escape from his subjective mind; *complete objectivity is pure spirituality.*

The dissolving of our social doubts and contradictions is to be accomplished by building shrines to the Eternal Right of the engineer and the artist

(the right that judges the tree by its fruit, the singer by his song, the worker by his works) and by bringing the priests and the politicians to renounce their morals and worship there.

When it is urged that the university of the people should be not only educational, but also religious and political, that it should absorb into itself the offices that are now given over to institutions that specialize in religion and politics, we are told that such a proposal is reactionary, that it runs counter to the evolutionary tendency toward variety of function and the division of labor. The objection proceeds upon a complete misunderstanding of the principle of social specialization. Social evolution demands infinite differentiation in the field of practical enterprise — workers of innumerable kinds; *but this differentiation of function must be accompanied by an integration of will and purpose, a gathering unity in the sphere of the social ideal.* In other words, true and useful specialization requires that society shall have singleness of aim. The more specialized men are in their practical affairs the less specialized must they be in their ideals. And, on the other hand, the more we specialize in the sphere of the ideal (the greater the number of sects, schools of thought, and political parties) the less capable shall we be of individualizing our day's work. A

city filled with jangling sects and parties can never achieve a high industrial organization. The exquisite division of labor which built the cathedrals of mediæval Europe was made possible by social single-mindedness. The people agreed in faith and morals.

The most imperative demand of a practical age — the demand of this age because it is more practical than any other — is the fusion of its ideal institutions, the identification of the institutions of religion, politics, and education.

Education is the synthetic term standing between what is sane in religion and what is sound in politics — and drawing these two things together. This is implied in the revolution now current in all the realms of pedagogy. Education everywhere is becoming on the one hand more idealistic, more respectful of the spiritual individuality of the learner, and on the other hand more practical — more technological. It is the grand lesson of the age that spirituality and practicality are correlative; that we cannot have one without the other. In the industrial republic education must be both religious and political. Of course there is a kind of religion and a kind of politics that has no place in the university or the public school. But religion of that description is a spiritual dissipation, and such politics a public nuisance.

The need of the integration of the social will as the *sine qua non* of high industrial organization and social progress ought to be evident from a general consideration of the principles of biologic evolution. Mr. Herbert Spencer's dictum, that life in its advance moves " from indefinite and incoherent homogeneity to definite and coherent heterogeneity," is a statement that fairly covers the case. This theorem, applied to the field of sociology, means that if we would have high civilization with its " heterogeneity," its infinite variety of offices and ministries, society must cohere at the heart, must be definite and simple in its motive.

If we prefer indefiniteness of ideals, incoherence at the centres of social vitality, we must content ourselves with sameness of occupation and must forego the delights of artistic individuality and a delicate adjustment of reciprocities. *The advance to a material civilization, more refined, more various and more free, requires that the church, the university, and the political primary shall be telescoped into a single institution.*

XII

THE COMMUNISM OF THE INTELLECT

"FORMERLY," said Bonaparte, "there was but one description of property — the possession of land; but now a new property has risen up — namely, industry." Say rather that the new property is *the ownership of industrial power.* The industrial power of a society is the sum of its artistic and scientific capabilities. This is the chief hereditament of civilization; it consists of a precious complex of talents bred into a race. It is an intellectual estate in which every member of society has equitably an undivided interest. This estate in the solid things of the mind is by rights a good half of the common wealth of a people—the land being the other half. And as every man should be regarded as a land-holder, in virtue of his existence — so also he should be a sharer in the usufruct of this invaluable transmitted and accumulated power. There never has been any sound statesmanship save that which has known how to husband and increase in the people this power. The trade of

politics has for the most part been intellectually contemptible because of its waste and neglect of the estate of social creative ability — as Colbert's great system of manufactures was destroyed immediately after his death by the ecclesiocratic politicians who scattered the Huguenot craftsmen.

Now the root of social iniquity is in the embezzlement from the mass of the people of their right and interest in the artistic and scientific competencies — the intellectual estate that has accumulated in the race. The new power of which Napoleon spoke was the control of this *kingdom of effectual ideas* by industrial magnates acting in their own private interest. Their method was the monopoly of commercial credit. Thus arose the aristocracy of the *bourgeoisie* until it over-balanced the aristocracy of land-holders, the old nobilities. And a new era was begun. The era has been called the age of capitalism — but that is not truly descriptive. The age which began with the French Revolution, and is now coming to its end, has been, in its most striking characteristic, the age of the private ownership of knowledge — the monopoly of the things of the mind. Men have bought and sold each other's brains, wrestling for the control of the artistic-scientific social estate — society's power to create values — exactly as the great feudalists of the former age battled for the pos-

session of the land. To the land-lords succeeded the brain-lords, the masters of all the intellectual heritage of civilization, with power to turn the people out of these commons and fence them in.

The magnate of the passing age has owed his authority not to the fact that he has been a tool-holder — a capitalist. For if all the tools — all the material means and instruments of wealth-production — were to be swept out of existence by some convulsion of nature, on the day after the calamity the power of the lord of brains would be found to be unimpaired. To him would the whole community resort, with all its diverse skills and accomplishments, and crave permission to bring its forces together for the work of restoring the frame of civilization. And the community could not realize upon its estate of ideal goods — its treasure of productive power locked in its heart — without the will and initiative of its lord. Over all minds of craftsmen, artists, and engineers he would exercise such a spell, such an enchantment, that none would dare turn a good thought into a productive deed until the master of minds should say, "Go on." The talisman of this marvellous authority would be, perhaps, a strongbox, filled with certificates of indebtedness — bonds, mortgages and so on — claims against society, enforceable by law. In this mystical, this purely psycho-

logical fact of the possession of an accumulation of legal credits, which the people should feel spiritually bound to enforce against themselves, would inhere the sovereignty of the brain-lord, the grand seigneur of the people's intellectual estate.

In the social order that is passing the great commercial creditor alone has had power to effect that correlation of working minds which is the source and essence of all material civilization. In the absence of a public organization for the economizing and safeguarding of the people's artistic and scientific heritage — its inherited skill of associated work, its precious accumulation of effective knowledge — this heritage has been made the loot and spoil of successful traders.

Now the university stands for the idea of social unity to be achieved by a high kind of communism, a communism not in material things, but in the things of the mind. The kind of social order toward which the university tends is one that has abolished that power of fraud which lies in the egotism of the intellect. It is an order which looks upon the private advantage gained by a superior intelligence over an inferior one as an embezzlement of public property — on the ground that all have an equal and vested interest in the truth. In such a society the intellect of the individual will work untrammelled in all the

processes whereby truth is elicited; there must be, in this sense, the freest intellectual competition. But all the private gains of knowledge must be brought into a common store, and the whole social energy must go to the enforcement of the truth that has gained public cognizance. This is the idea of the university, this publicizing of all facts of common interest, in order to break up the monopolies that are based upon the suppression of truth.

The university is the voluntary association of those who have no trade-secrets, and are determined to enlist the force of law to destroy the power of egotistic intellect. For what is science but public knowledge, knowledge meant for and belonging to all men? And what is art but work that is public in its motive, addressing itself to the human spirit of all conditions?

A man may be said to think and act in the spirit of the university only when he has ceased to depend for his success upon the tricks of his trade, and has committed himself with faith and daring to the things of the open air and the open heart, trusting wholly to the artistic and scientific value of his product. All professions are corrupted by esoterism and purified by publicity. A charlatan makes a mystery of his trade; a master rejoices in intelligibleness.

The university of the people is an association devoted to whole-heartedness and simplicity, to the discovery and enjoyment of the real world. Its covenant is candor, fortified by faith in God and man — a faith that all the hard facts of nature are salutary and amenable to reason.

We must come to understand that the destruction of the poor, and of the rich also — the confusion of our actual society, its incompetence in the earth-struggle and its blindness to beauty, are not due to any intrinsic weakness of human nature, but solely to the fact that *we have not yet got together in the truth or for the truth.* The civil law under which we live is based upon the principle of intellectual monopoly, the supposed right of every man to make a private and exclusive use of his knowledge. The public school, in its ideal and ground-plan, is a standing witness against this inherited egotism, but it is, so far, a nearly impotent witness — because children do not rule the world. It is impossible for infants to work out the social implications of the public school. The child-heart needs a man's will to make it effectual. And the children leave the schools before they become men. Then they grow up and receive their convincing lessons in the ways of the world's business, in an atmosphere that is saturated with the reek of the sweat of a desperate game.

The public school stands for the catholicity of intellectual power. Its proclamation is that the whole truth is for all alike, that no one shall take advantage of the ignorance of another. Spite of the weakness of children, great things might come of this, after awhile and in the long run, if the proclamation were plainly written to be plainly read. But the school cannot shut out the world, and the world of crafty trade presses into the class-room by every door and window — to sophisticate the message. Thus the children sit from year to year in the light of a world-renewing evangel, and they do not merely forget it; they never once have come to understand it. The gospel of the public school is that the truth is for all alike and no one shall take advantage of another's ignorance. But what gets lodged in the mind of the child may be something entirely different — to wit: That all shall have a fighting chance to seize upon the truth and carry it away as a prize! For this is the doctrine of our hereditary law.

Democracy is communism in the truth. It is not communism in goods and chattels, not the abolishment of private property. So far as private property can justify itself as useful for the advancement of art and science — it shall stand and be strengthened. But democracy hates cunning and circumvention; it will make an end

of all the privileges that flow from secrecy and subterfuge.

The new order is a communism in science and art. But it is not enough that the gifts of art and science should be passively offered to all — the Muses singing in open, sunlit cloisters. That is good, but it is not enough. The creative intellect is not merely a white still light. It is also a living flame. *Intellectual power is passion heated to incandescence.* It is an energy and a propaganda. It is government — it is law. Minerva is armed; the university is militant. The symbol of the liberty which it proclaims to the world is a figure of Truth with a flaming light in one hand and in the other a naked sword! The university of the people contends for the possession of the police-power; it fights for the throne.

So then a genuine democracy is to arise out of a militant university, a political power that shall execute the law in the spirit of the arts and sciences. It shall destroy the monopolies of greed and craft and make the candid truth a great force among men.

XIII

THE UNIVERSITY — MISTRESS OF THE MARKET

THE true interpretation of "the square deal" is that it is the special and principal office of government *to enforce the equality of all bargains.* Thus ambitious enterprise must be diverted from the field of exchange to that of industry, from the business of buying and selling to that of producing goods.

Socialists say that the social disease is private initiative and free competition in the supply of the market. They are mistaken. The disease is the lack of public organization of the market itself. What we need is not public organization of production, but the public control of exchanges. It is neither necessary, nor desirable, nor even tolerable, that we should politicize *supply;* but it is indispensable to progress that we should publicize *demand.*

The evil of "the system" as it exists is that it makes the credit upon which the initiative of industry depends flow from the people's *debts* or

necessities, instead of from their *demands* or desires. Thus commodities are produced without any regard to effective demand or buying power. Hence come "over-production" and every manner of industrial dislocation. What is needed is artistic and scientific organization of the market. In a genuine industrial society the enforcement of equality of values in exchange must come to be the primary office of public law.

The establishment of such an organization of the market would not abolish productive competition, but accelerate it. Under existing conditions there is in fact no true productive competition — no competition for competency, or rivalry in public service. The existing competition is for the control of the market. Thus the public organization of the market would not do away with competition, but would reverse its aim — would stop the struggle for price-fixing power and throw men back upon that struggle for existence that is normal to social and intellectual beings — to wit: the struggle for value-producing power.

Adam Smith's idea, that free competition for profits must result in the maximum of public-serving, is true for an imaginary society in which there are no partnerships and no industrial combinations. So long as men come to market as dissociated individuals, each with his handiwork in

his hands, competition for profits and competition for a chance to serve society may indeed be practically identical. But such conditions never really existed on any considerable scale, and the theory becomes more and more unworkable with the growth of high industrial organization. Instead of competing for opportunity to serve society, to raise general wages and lower prices, the competition comes more and more to be a rivalry for opportunity to lower the incomes of the people and increase the prices that they must pay. And this power to lower wages and raise prices is a true definition of monopoly. Free competition in the market is a theory of closet-philosophy. Free *productive* competition is possible, is necessary to social health and progress; but it cannot be had in any place where there is lawless bargaining. The way to have freer *productive* competition is through the legal restriction and regulation of *commercial* competition. *The public must corner its own market.*

It is impossible for the public to corner its own market until it evolves a public intellect, an intelligence that works steadily in the interest of the public. And this is our pressing task. In a million egotists and money-makers there may not be a single gleam of public intelligence. A public mind cannot be got by balancing the pull and haul of a

multitude of self-wrapt private minds. The intelligence that is available for public uses belongs only to those who are intent not upon money-making, the raising of their commercial credit, but upon the production of real values. It belongs to those who get their joy in their work, to good craftsmen and engineers, to artists, and men of science. The mission of the university is to create a public intelligence capable of assessing the relative value of things and of making good bargains for the public.

We may have our choice between free industry and free trade; we cannot have both. If exchanges are unregulated, industry will be enslaved. If industry is to be emancipated, trade must be put under legal bonds. We must choose between the freedom of the trader and that of the workman. If under the law the trader is left to drive as hard a bargain as he can, he will drive the masses of the people to the wall. Five thousand years of recorded experience prove it. And thus the whole social energy will be turned from a wholesome rivalry for efficiency to a degrading competition for privilege.

The gist of privilege is the power to fix the price of one's own services — the power of arbitrary taxation. And so long as the public gives over its right to fix prices, this right must continue

to be the capital prize of egotistic ambition. For the power to fix prices is the substance of sovereignty — whether the sovereign reigns or only rules, whether he sits in purple upon the throne or only holds in pawn the crown and sceptre. Taxation is the legal raising of prices; it is arbitrary and tyrannous if done for any other reason than one only — namely, to improve the general standard of living. Whether arbitrary and tyrannous taxes be levied by spendthrift princes and governors, or by Napoleons of finance who have learned how to make princes and governors their bailiffs for the enforcement of the bad bargains of the poor — is an indifferent matter to those who pay.

Business may look to either of two ends; it may engross itself in the technological processes that tend to the production of substantial values, or in the financial machinations and advertising devices that look toward the control of the market. Contemporary business in America, generally speaking, subordinates the former end to the latter. It will continue to do so, will be obliged to do so, in spite of the stifled good intentions of the mass of business men, so long as American markets are lawless. Men of business are driven against their will to fight each other for the control of the market. Every man strives to grasp the reins of

the price-making and public-taxing power — in order that he may not himself be taxed out of existence by his rivals.

The beneficent revolution now in process — the "enabling" acts conceding to cities the power to make the rates of public-service corporations, the anti-rebate and railroad rate-fixing principle — has vast involutions that must soon be unfolded. The revolution has begun and will go on. There is no stopping-place short of the repudiation of the most consecrated political and economic superstitions of our fathers. The obvious end of it all is the rise, in every American city, of a public intellect dominating the market-place.

There is no mystery about the cause of the life and death of nations; they flourish as long as the public mind is strong enough to hold intellectual egotism in check, and they disintegrate and perish in the discordant rivalry of private wills. This discord begins by rending all the social tissues, but it ends in the enfeeblement of all private minds. It does not produce an *élite* of "super-men" as has been fondly imagined. And the reason for the intellectual decadence of egotists lies in the fact that intellect is, in its very nature, expansive, public, and impersonal. By the laws of life all the gains and honors of advancing knowledge are public property. Nature will have it so; and will take

vengeance if it be not so. Any class that takes advantage of its superior knowledge to out-bargain the unlearned and ignorant is sure to become an intellectually decadent class — losing its grip upon reality and the elemental world.

Unregulated competition in bargain-making — *i. e.*, in the exchange of personal services and commodities — must always drive the mass of a population to a condition of indigence; and must, on the other hand, produce a privileged class standing in abnormal relations to nature. This will happen, no matter how high the general average of book-learning may be raised; for the point is the relative intellectual weakness of some as compared with others. The consequence of free bargaining must always be the widening of a gulf between the rich and poor. And the process will lead to general intellectual decadence. *For intellectual power in its last analysis is simply the ability to make a sound estimate of the relative value of things.* And this power must wane in a state divided between the rich and poor. The poor cannot have a nice sense of relative values, cannot see life in wide perspective, since their minds are dominated by a need that admits of no relativity, no shading, but is bald and absolute. And, on the other hand, those who are cushioned and walled in from contact with natural law, who pay

for what they get, not with love or hate, neither with laughter nor labor, nor any other personal force, but only with checks drawn upon banks — these cannot possibly see things in their true proportions. Thus necessity and luxury are alike debilitating to intellect; and mental paralysis and racial degeneracy must fall upon a people whose daily exchanges of commodities and personal services are conducted on the commercial principles of our tradition.

The principles of lawless commerce are fraud and duress. Fraud is the private use or concealment of superior knowledge; and this unhappily has been, for long, the settled custom of commerce. A bargain is an offence to the intellect when the profit of it is shared unequally because of the pressing need of one of the parties. *Yes, a bargain made in a lawless market between a hungry man and one who is well fed, is the perfect type of uncivilization.*

There might be an infinite gradation of wealthiness, but there would be no poverty if there were no fraud. It is evident from a comparison of the natural powers of poor men with those of beasts and birds that squalor and rags are not in the ground-plan of nature. The poor are made poor by fraud; and they are kept so by duress — by the fact that the terms of their bargains with

prosperous people are dictated not by reason, but by necessity.

When riches and poverty become fixed institutions, progress stops. In a society thus definitively afflicted there can be no improvement of the human type. The individual consciousness ceases to expand and begins to contract. Life grows paler and thinner. The sensibilities are dulled. There is a gradual enfeeblement of the sense of personal existence. In the midst of a feverish development of æstheticism, athleticism, and the complication of machinery — the arts and sciences decline.

To those who have an inkling of these self-executing laws, faith in the ultimate and permanent triumph of the Public Mind over the egotist, does not need the support of miracles or the devotion of saints. Such a one perceives that he is not called upon to macerate himself, that there is no contradiction between his own real interest and that of the public. And he understands that when he is asked to help establish the authority of the Public Mind over the wide field of exchanges, he is invited to get up and fight for his own life. He knows that he will be pinched and shrivelled if he does not get up; that, rich or poor, his life will wither within him.

XIV

SUMMARY

NO man that talks in platitudes — saying what everybody admits to be so — can make any real contribution to the new order. And nobody who takes action merely to "enforce the law" as it stands can be regarded as a man of the modern spirit. There is need of a new ethic. What was once regarded as a "square deal" has become treason and felony. The new ethical principle, working its way into people's minds in spite of the lack of literary expression, is that business must first of all do good, the profits must be secondary and contingent. This idea is of course strictly revolutionary. Honesty in the past has meant *not meaning to steal;* in the future it will mean *the determination to produce real values.*

As the source of all our social misery is the unequal bargain made between men of unequal wits, so the regeneration is to be found in the rise of a political association that shall stand for the public supervision of bargains, the setting forth

of all exchanges on grounds that lie open to the day. The spirit of our traditionary law consecrates all private bargains and enforces all. Its fatuity consists in the fact that it consecrates and enforces fatuity, the bad bargains of the witless. Thus to the aristocracy of breeding has succeeded an oligarchy of chicane — a polity that has contented itself with giving to every man a desperate fighting-chance of being smarter than his neighbors.

Why do the arts fail — the finer arts that minister to the mind and the coarser arts that feed, clothe, and house the people? Because the university hitherto has lived in a cloister. There is no power in mere stores of information heaped in libraries — or in heads. The truth must fight for its footing. Those who contend for the arts and sciences must not rest content in a city that is dominated by the military or the money power, by the superstitions of clergymen or the fictions of lawyers. Does this mean that the *scholar* shall go into politics? No; that the *university* shall. The university becomes the party of the arts and sciences — striving openly to get the police power into the hands of the masters of materials. The university is not a close corporation of intellectual people. Intellect and exclusiveness are contradictory terms. The university is by its very

nature democratic — a communism of intellect. It makes all truth public property. It hates the caste of culture.

It is impossible for the university to escape from the obscurant rule of a privileged class, otherwise than by making itself a power in politics. It must stoop to conquer. It must become the champion of the ignorant before it can become *itself*.

The university in humbling itself will be exalted. In offering its services to the poor and ignorant the power of the majority will pass into it. It will become the seat of popular government. The people will accept its services; they cannot help it. And they will acknowledge its authority; because it is irresistible.

The two final forms of order are: (1) the rule of the taxing power and (2) the rule of the power to create goods. The world has been governed for a long time by those who, one way or another, have had power to tax people, to make their bread dear; now, after a little, the world-sceptre will pass to those who can cheapen the necessaries of life. For the power to serve the people is exactly as compulsive as the power to tax them. Men are by the very law of their nature obliged to follow the lead of their saviors.

It is impossible for men in mass to refuse a

real and recognized improvement. Hence it is not a figure of speech to talk of the "rule" of the efficient. Those who can bless the race are as imperious as those who can blight it — and their authority is equally irresistible. Their administration will be not less, but more energetic. Tolstoi was wrong in supposing that a society freed from privilege and oppression would have no use for force. The fact is that a greater social energy and momentum can be induced by hope than by fear. Woe to those who stubbornly oppose a people that is mobilized for progress!

The waste of "the system," the financial régime under which we live, is not summed up merely in the diverting of immense quantities of created wealth, through the channels of interest and profit, to the maintenance of an enervating luxury. The chief waste is of the wealth that is *not* produced, for lack of capital. For the crowning vice of "capitalism" is that it destroys capital; it condemns the majority to dull routine through lack of the tools necessary to more interesting enterprises.

In a perfectly healthy society all wealth would be capital; *i. e.*, nothing would be produced save the kind of things that were conducive to the further production of good things. But the interest and aim of capitalism is to restrict the

amount of reproductive goods — *live wealth* or capital, and to increase the amount of *dead wealth* or luxury.

The free play of "the system" tends toward the lowering of the interest rate — a fact which has not been sufficiently considered by either the socialists or the orthodox economists. This means the lessening of the demand for tools, and the basing of the power of the great "captains of industry" upon the sheer hold of the creditor over the debtor. Society as a whole falls into a state of peonage and is obliged to serve its masters because it cannot pay its debts. What is called by the socialists Capitalism is therefore not really the rule of the capitalist as such, but the rule of the creditor. It should rather be called *Creditism* — or *Padronism*. The development of this *padronism* has already brought to pass that the mere investor — *i. e.*, the capitalist — is continually and systematically sacrificed to the interest of the great franchise-holders and trust managers. *The tendency is toward a state of affairs in which capital as such will have no power at all; nobody will be able to get an income by lending tools.* The great creditors will have the use and control of all available tools on their own terms — even without interest — simply in virtue of their repressive power as creditors, *their power to foreclose upon*

society and stop the vital processes, unless their terms are acceded to.

The amazing demand for Panama bonds illustrates the foregoing principle that mere capitalism or interest-taking is not the real coign of vantage in the control of our industrial order. Such securities may some day be sold altogether without interest, to corporation-managers intent upon perfecting their estate as public creditors. The point is that the preoccupation of our traditionary law is in the collection of private debts — to the neglect of the real aim of civilization, which is the keeping of society out of debt. Society itself should be the predominant creditor.

Every government in Europe and America — in the whole circle of commerce — is virtually bankrupt, since it is being administered for the benefit of its creditors. The officers of state constitute a receivership charged with the liquidation of the social obligation — with a general disregard for the fortunes of the debtor class.

Socialism proceeds upon a false diagnosis, and so can offer no availing remedy for this state of affairs. Its proposed collective ownership of tools would not touch the root of the disease — which is social insolvency through the failure of society to husband its own assets. It would be easy under a socialist system for a *party*, a class, to

control, and so in effect to "own" — the tools of production. This would be done by the methods of patronage that parties use to-day. The motive-force of socialism is the promotion of the majority — the false principle that begets party-rule. Socialism evinces no perception of the principle that is really capable of getting the public out of debt — which is not the rule of the majority, but the rule of the capable.

The social struggle upon which we are entering is tripartite. Two of the parties to the great controversy are already very much in evidence; they seem indeed to cover the whole field. The late Senator Hanna had only these two in view when he said that the issue of the near future lay between Imperialism and Socialism. Mr. Hanna did not perceive — he was perhaps so constituted that he *could* not perceive — that the issue between imperialism, and socialism, between plutocracy and proletarianism, between "the communism of capital" and that of "labor" — is superficial and illusory. It affects only private fortunes — determines the *personnel* of privilege. Bonaparte or Robespierre?

From the point of view of those who look for news, this immemorial controversy is a dreadful and futile sham battle, a bloody game of broken heads and hearts. Organized capital and organ-

ized labor are both obscurant and reactionary. Each necessitates the other, to be sure; yet life would be unlivable if either of them could finally and utterly succeed, which happily is impossible. They can only turn and return, with endless *bouleversements,* like those marionette wrestlers with hands riveted together that hawkers sell in the street.

The third party in the struggle is of course that company of sensible men whose interest in beauty and reality is stronger than their " class consciousness." But these will inevitably be drawn into the class struggle, one by one, until none are left to speak for humanity and the arts — unless now, while there is yet time, they form their Macedonian phalanx, their " flying wedge."

ADDENDA

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

The articles following — mostly from the hand of the author — are excerpts from the Newsbook, *a thick duodecimo volume projected as a quarterly magazine and published by the Municipal University of Kansas City, Missouri.*

They are reprinted here for the light they shed on the practical workings of an institution engendered in the spirit of this book.

They should help to convince the reader that the author's protest against the academic conception of the University, is not itself merely academic, but is on the contrary capable of being translated into an effective and regenerative political power.

FOR THE WHOLE OF KANSAS CITY — EAST AND WEST

MEN are usually true to those who really trust them. Even the boss is boss because he keeps faith with the special interest that depends upon him. Make him the trusted agent of the general interest and, ten to one, he will be true to that. Anyhow, there are a dozen men in every block who will.

Give us city government "by commission," with ample powers to the commissioners and distinct

responsibility. The corruption of the cities is due to the legal complication of checks and balances, the net-work of systematic suspicion.

Our intricate scheme of city government is mediæval. It cannot mobilize the creative forces. It is framed to balance the egotisms of rival classes, but is utterly unfit for a generous people bent upon an enterprise in common — the subdual of the earth and the raising of the standard of life.

For the whole of Kansas City — East and West!

Let us have government by commission on both sides of the State line. And then let the two groups of commissioners form a "gentlemen's agreement" — a Public Trust — for the comprehensive administration of the whole municipal district. The merger of public corporations is the best defense against the merger of private ones.

Not now, but pretty soon — when Kansas City shall have a million — its metropolitan district should include Jackson, Clay, and Platte counties in Missouri, and Wyandotte and Johnson in Kansas — or say, all the land within a radius of twenty-five miles from the mouth of the Kaw. For a city that cannot support its own population is sociologically parasitic. It cannot escape from slums, swelldom, and the other deadly symptoms.

THE NEWSBOOK

A PERIODICAL should be, after a fashion and however humbly, a work of art; and it is the nature of a work of art that it sets up its own standard and is not to be judged by anything outside. It is good if it tastes good.

You see at a glance that this publication does not conform to the common prepossession as to what a magazine ought to be. It is not like the solemn reviews — not to be compared, even at a great distance, with the *North American* or the ancient oracle of Edinburgh. And it is as far removed from *Scribner's* and *Munsey's* and all the other pleasant dispensers of mental lunches and literary vaudeville.

This book, in its body, is what it is because we are not able to find any better form, just now, to express its meaning. It exists to give feature to an authority that is rising up out of the very ground and that will not be silenced — or even any longer muffled. This is the age — and this Western land is especially the place — that belongs by right to the spirit of the university and to the Masters of Materials. The Masters of the Sword and the Masters of the Purse have had their day. They are a race of *fainéant* Merovin-

gian kings who must now give place to the hardier stock of this new Charlemagne.

. . . . . .

It is curious how the traders in printed stuffs, ever so attentive to the market-demands and eager to set out a new pattern in poems or prose if there is anywhere a whistle for it, curious that they should have put every kind of a thing upon their book-stalls and news-stands except the thing that is most wanted.

What the people want is a higher standard of living and a public organ to articulate that demand. They want the necessaries of life to be cheaper, and the graces more attainable. What they get from the teeming presses is an infinite outpour of anodynes, a million inducements to spend their time and money, and to relax and scatter their wills. This is curious and remarkable, but it is not mysterious. Certainly not. It is of a piece with a thousand other anomalies of our impracticable commercialism.

. . . . . .

The remark usually passes without criticism that the Press is a great power. It was once called the Fourth Estate; but no one would describe it in that way to-day — it is now rather supposed to be the First. Yet the simple truth is that the Press as

we actually know it is a convenience — an indispensable convenience. It is a great power in about the same sense that the Laundry is — or the Market Garden. Certainly it is a prodigy of moral and intellectual passivity — a spineless cactus, framed for the ruminants. It has its way with us not by leading us, but by following us — and waylaying us in dark places.

It is unintelligent to blame the individual newspaper man for this state of affairs. It is with journalism as it is with the Army or the Church; the huge system moves with irresistible fatality, carrying the individual along, or driving over him if he misses the step. And the newspaper business has had its full share of martyrs. But it is not unreasonable to conceive, in this changing world, that the whole existing system of news-mongering may, by orderly processes and in due time, be superseded by a better.

. . . . . .

There are indeed sound reasons for believing that the newspaper is destined to stand, by and by, in the very focus of social force. Genuine democracy is the enthronement of the artistic-scientific intellect. And under modern conditions the characteristic organ of the intellect is not a book or a library, but a newspaper. For it is the very

essence of modernity that the intellect is ceasing to be dogmatic, and is learning to take things on the fly, to shoot without a rest.

The intellect of the Old World never ventured out of doors without a smooth-wrapped generalization tucked umbrella-wise under its arm; but the modern intellect thrives in the wind and rain, and swims strongest in the swiftest stream of change. So then if journalism is the intellectual mastery of current events, it must have the supreme seat of authority in that kingdom which is at hand. In the social order dominated by the working intellect, *the newspaper will be the government.*

Conversely it is true that the most effective way of hastening the new day and the "new deal" is to move for the evolution of the new and authentic kind of journal. The NEWSBOOK presents itself as a fairly well nucleated germ-cell, or, say, a knot of the most rudimentary organic filaments, that by careful nursing may grow into a true type of democratic journalism. It claims consideration and criticism, not for its bulk, nor yet for its quality, but solely for its kind. *It is a new species.*

. . . . . .

The idea of a counting-room newspaper — the moral and intellectual topsy-turvydom of a con-

cern that gravely makes law and politics to measure, that offers ethical sentiments and sanitary science to fit the lean or fit the fat — this, certainly, when it ceases to be a serious fact, will become a humorous fancy, a tale of Troll-land delightful to the children of another day. That a working sociologist, a professional publicist — and that is what a newspaper man really pretends to be — that such a character should be engaged in writing up or writing down particular classes and special interests will, some day, seem as grotesque as that Bruno should fix his astronomical science to suit the Pope or that a modern biologist should take a retainer from the Methodist Church.

The NEWSBOOK is an attempt, on the smallest tangible scale, to embody the following ideas:

I. Journalism — meaning the intellectual comprehension of passing events — is going to be the dominant force of a genuine democracy, virtually the sovereign power.

II. It is absurd that a newspaper of this new kind should be owned by a commercial corporation or managed for profit. It must be owned and controlled by an association created in the spirit that exults in artistic and scientific achievement. It is a mistake to suppose that this requires an evolution of human nature and the production of a bet-

ter kind of men than those that are all about us. It requires merely a new social combination.

III. As the university spirit, penetrating the heart of the cities, is the soul of the new social movement, so the artistic-scientific newspaper is the body of that soul. To read the same print, and to have some kind of a part in bringing it into being — that is the intimate, modern bond of communion between men of one mind. What rituals were once, the saying of the same prayers and singing of the same hymns; what oratory was, and the physical contact of dense-packed political meetings — that the daily and periodical press has now become. And more and more, with the modern distaste for committing oneself to creeds and platforms — to any and every possible statement of abstract principles — men in whom this modern spirit is strong are brought to a pass where they can only say to one another: Let us take a brief for persecuted Nature; we will be hot partisans of science, and close-knit gangsters for the human race. Parties and sects fade. The most representative men can unite upon nothing save a common love for what is real.

In this emergency the university idea offers itself as the only ground for the effective correlation of wills. And the newspaper — the most subtile, versatile, and spiritual invention of the ages — be-

comes the adequate organ for their expression. Its union is not of the letter, but of the spirit. Thus some members of the Municipal University may not agree with all that is said in this issue of the NEWSBOOK; very well, they can unite to produce fresh issues that shall be more reasonable.

IV. The effective organization of that voiceless middle American public which stands hesitating to-day between the Machiavellian "System" and the Deep Sea of Socialism requires the establishing of this new kind of newspaper in every city and town — a monthly or weekly newsbook, artistic, scientific, and cheap, backed everywhere by a civic university. The solution of our social and political problem lies in sheer bald truth-speaking — in the spirit of art and science. All we need is light and air, floods of both, in the dark places. Every other device will fail. If we neglect this now, we shall return to it. The social problem narrows down to this point: How can we get an artistic-scientific newspaper, a perfectly healthy organ of publicity — a newspaper so made that it thrives in the sunlight and the open air, and cannot thrive otherwise? That is the question. The answer has been indicated above.

V. It is a matter of simple psychology to prove that a newspaper conducted by the managers of a corporation for the financial profit of its stock-

holders cannot possibly steer clear of "graft"; the suction is all in that direction. The managers may be scrupulous; if so, their conscientiousness will keep them from sacrificing to the public the private interests of their employers. Besides, it is not enough that a newspaper should try not to do wrong; such a disposition has no salvation in it. What is wanted is a publication that is keen for discovery and revelation, alive with the delight of finding new ways of doing right. The kind of a newspaper corporation we need is one that has no more thought of dividends than a church has, or a college, or an art institute.

It is not a question of personalities. The old-line newspaper men would, of course, do better work under the new arrangements than could upstart idealists and puritans.

VI. How to get the driving-force for this enterprise? Throw on to the wire a portion at least of the immense voltage that is being used so uneconomically in the factitious rivalry between indistinguishable religious sects and political parties. There is no city or country town in the United States where a university of the people and an artistic-scientific newspaper could not be created with half the moral energy that is being thus wasted.

VII. The newspaper of the future will be more arrestive, more humanly interesting and pictur-

esque than anything we have yet seen. Our journalistic swing between sensationalism and insipidity is a curable disease. And we have not yet formed a conception of the swift gains we should make in practical matters — like the natural-gas problem in this city, the planning and financing of a union station, and so on — if we only had some way of bringing the intellect and experience of the world to a local focus at the right moment, and in a manner free from suspicion. Usually we do not get the best expert testimony on any subject, but only the second or tenth best. And the truth that we do get from the extant press is for the most part unavailable, because there is no known system of public assay whereby we can pick out the truth from the mass of reports that are not true.

The tireless mayor of Kansas City leaves his office and journeys from town to town to pick up scraps of information about the terminal problem — not that he claims any special competency in the matter save singleness of mind. What a confession is that whole business of our lack of an organ of public intellect!

VIII. This publishing enterprise of ours may not go fast. It gets up and goes as fast as it can.

At fifty cents, the book is of course too dear to have an extensive circulation. It lies with the public to make it better and cheaper — and put it into

every house in town. It offers itself as a labor-saving tool, a public utility with incalculable latent values. It claims to be an instrument which, if a few hundred discerning men will deign to use it, will save the city millions of dollars, obviate many confusions and perplexities, and raise the general standard of living in this place. This expectation is based not upon any special talent or virtue in the projectors, but wholly upon the method employed. The gist of the method lies in the design to create a journalistic concern that is neither capitalistic nor eleemosynary, that is conducted neither for profits nor for charity. If it were capitalized or endowed, the project would, in the ordinary course of human nature, become — what the run of publications are. We rest our case on the personal interest that sensible men are bound to invest in entirely public aims.

That such an undertaking is unique is not our fault; it is the fault of the social system in which we live. It will not for long continue to be exceptional. All business corporations will in due time be brought to serve the public on the same terms. The winning of a true and civilized type of journalistic corporation is merely the strategic point in the battle for the new order. Win that, and the rest will be easy. The quintessence of that new order is that it takes the initiative and

control of enterprise away from the Money Power and gives it to the Power to Think Straight. It is endlessly degrading that money should control the mind of the world; civilization requires that the mind shall control the money.

IX. The present contents of the NEWSBOOK are merely germinal — serving to indicate the line of possible development. The book does not grow out of the desire to get these things printed. They are rather the deciduous leaves upon the limbs of an Idea, an Idea burgeoning easily and inevitably without much insistence from any man — and without anxiety. If the Idea escapes from this book and leaves our words to mat the paths in Vallombrosa, we have no doubt that it will survive elsewhere — and will command the service of stronger hands.

THE MUNICIPAL UNIVERSITY

WE raise a hue and cry about the " reign of graft," the " shame of the cities " and the " plunderbund." Demagogues of high and low degree — good fellows are sometimes demagogues — tell us that we, the American people, are an honest and noble race, but that a few thousand black sheep have crept by night into our immaculate flock. We are told that the solution of all our social problems con-

sists in separating the " decent people " from those that are not so decent, by an impassable *abatis* of prison-bars. This is at best a grave mistake in diagnosis. The fact is that " graft " is an epidemic social disease — and not one of us is free from the taint of it. The vile humor is commercialism — a morbid commercialism, sick for lack of any social standard for the assessing of real values. We give it a bad name and call it " graft " only when it rises — as by irresistible capillarity it must rise — up out of the region that we had agreed to call " private business " into that which we have called " public business." We have in the past supposed that the ice men, for instance, could plague the public as much as they pleased and be held blameless — if they found it profitable; but if the policeman should abate a little of their public devotion and make a dollar " on the side," we have been thrown into fits of moral hysteria.

Now this distinction is not permanently valid. It is impossible that men who go to the same churches and belong to the same clubs should do their day's work on opposite ethical principles. In the long run — and we are coming to the end of a pretty long run — one of these two irreconcilable theories of what is right and decent must conquer and hold the territory of the other. The policeman's ethics must drive the ice-wagon, or the ice

man's, the patrol wagon. It has been possible to keep up the illusive distinction so long only because it has been supposed that there was a clean-cut difference between public and private business. That idea is appendicitic, a dangerous survival of the feudal order — which despised trade and did not foresee that business men might some day aspire to associate with gentlemen.

According to that old-fashioned way of thinking, private business was contemptible just because of its privacy — its narrow self-interestedness. All the honorable occupations were assimilated to the public service. The so-called liberal professions were well-esteemed because a lawyer, a physician, a clergyman, a military officer, a man of letters was supposed to act not as a bought or hired man, but as a free and self-directing person, a member of the governing class. Or, to go a little deeper into the mind of feudalism, it may be said that the gentry were gentlemen because they were supposed to "like their job," to be in it for their health, while the mechanics and tradespeople worked because they had to.

A gentleman "of the old school" might take money for his work. There was no harm in that. Only it must be perfectly clear that the work was not done for the sake of the money; that the motive was in his own will. Up to a recent date in

England there was no form of legal action whereby a lawyer could collect a fee; the British bar refrained from the assertion of its rights in this regard in order to emphasize the principle that a barrister was an officer of the court, an agent of public justice, and that his interest lay in that quarter, his honorarium being incidental and non-essential. So it was of the ethics of the medical profession — inhibiting a physician from patenting his medicines, from advertising his specialty or from keeping therapeutic secrets from the fraternity. A clergyman likewise might indeed be venal and sordid of soul, but it was impossible for him to get a parish otherwise than on the general assumption that he was driven to his work not by the bill-collector, but by the inner voice, that it was woe to him not to preach. And so it was of the painter and the poet, the lieutenant and the lord mayor. A gentleman might plow, hunt, dig in the trenches, hold the towel at a clinic or wash the feet of lepers — but he must not work for pay.

There is a democratic soul of truth in every stubborn aristocratic prejudice. "The hireling fleeth because he *is* an hireling and careth not; but the Good Shepherd lays down his life for the sheep." And the cogency of this principle loses nothing by lapse of time; the man that works because he wants to is bound to have a better earth-

grip than the fellow who takes hold because he wants to let go. There is n't a ghost of a show for the Hired Man, when once the Master of the House shall have decided to make an issue.

The distinction between professional and official ethics on the one hand, and the ethics of the manufacturer and trader on the other, is maintainable only through the social subordination of the latter class. So long as the man of business was content to sit below the salt and confess that he was not much of a gentleman, there was no moral absurdity in his doing his day's work in a less high-spirited way than the priest or the prince did. But when the social centre of gravity passed over to the industrial and commercial class — the Third Estate — then the distinction between high-tempered public business and low-toned private business became an anachronism. It was manifest destiny that one ideal or the other should possess the whole field of social activity; and the battle between the two principles began to be waged in the very citadel and heart of all the Western peoples. The abolishment of chattel slavery, with the rise of constitutionalism and universal suffrage, has made the re-establishment of the double moral standard quite out of the question.

The die is cast; and either the Master or the

Hired Man, the artist or the chafferer, must rule the house.

So far it must be admitted that the hucksters have it. But one understands little of the revenges of history — the sure recoil of spiritual forces — who does not know that the long-repressed idealism of the Western races, their baffled art and chivalry, are gathering for a return game. The Traders had it for a day. They reached their high-tide in the United States the day before yesterday — say in 1898.

In those hard times of poignant prosperity millions of faces were drawn in dissimulation, the fixed face of the trader who barters his life for a living. The professions had all become trades — the law business, the newspaper business, the medical business, the clerical business — and over and under all, the trade of politics. From the postman to the President, men got and kept their places more by artifice than artistry. Men capable in happier times of indisputable honesty, jocund and debonair, climbed to high places by the aid of the "system" and the "machine" — because, bless your heart! there was no other way to climb. Society was drenched and drowned in the reek of graft. About everybody within the range of ordinary vision kept his social place and drew his income by a more or less systematic sub-

ordination of general human interests to some interest that was special and private. And that — if the ill-featured word has a meaning — is "graft."

What minister with a healthy mind could speak it without losing influence? What notably prosperous lawyer was not the wage-slave of a corporation? What newspaper man but laughed contemptuously — or bitterly — at the very name of journalism? The mass of Americans do not yet understand this. It is still supposed that the Treason was only of the Senate and of poor old Mr. McCall and Standard Oil; whereas the Treason was in us all. The trader's — traitor's — art was the only fine art that we as a people did much affect.

But the tide has turned. And it would run swiftly — if only sensible men, who ought to know better, were less content to paddle in the shallows. Childish is the notion that we can have a "great moral reform" that shall end in making politicians and preachers devout, and trust magnates and millionaires innocuous — so that ten million frightened little business men can return with thankful hearts to their interrupted game of pluck-the-goose and beggar-my-neighbor! It is a pipe-dream. Nothing like that ever really happened.

Let it be set down here in legible type that *the distinction between private business and public business has grown hazy and is about to vanish.* This is the biggest news item of the century thus far. Every business that serves the public is a part of the public service; and every business that does not is a public nuisance. Many have prophesied of this. Federal Judge Waite, for example, had a clear glimpse of the idea some years ago when he said, in the famous case of Munn against the State of Illinois, that "private property, when it is devoted to a public end" — meaning in that case the plaintiff's investment of his money in a Chicago grain elevator — "becomes subject to public regulation." The point is that there is no stopping-place in our rate-fixing, food-inspecting, factory-regulating career, short of the simple and regenerative conception that all business must be raised to a public and professional standard; that, all down the line, money-making must become a distinctly secondary consideration, and that the man who "is in it for what he can make out of it" must eat at the second table with the hired hands.

. . . . . .

Now it would seem that the Church of the near future, whether it shall be called by that name

or a better, will be a company of men who preach, practice law and medicine, farm, traffic, and manufacture because they are interested in the subdual of the earth and the building of cities, and are bound to get it done right. Those on the other hand who are mainly interested in making money, by any means not jailable, and who look forward to becoming tall-hatted, black-coated, and philanthropic in their latter years — may continue to run the old kind of churches so long as there are any such to run.

It is to be noted that the new kind of Church will, by its very nature, recover a great deal of ground that has been vacated by the old kind. It will be a social and political institution — in the sense that it will hold the balance of practical power between the wrangling social classes.

And in the third place the new Church will be the basic educational institution of our democratic communities, the university of the people. It will have nothing to do with any kind of religion that cannot and ought not to penetrate the public schools.

Having thus pulled himself together and gotten rid of the triple complex of feudal idealisms — ecclesiastical, scholastic, and political — the Western man will have a new taste for existence, and be prepared to live the simple life. For simplic-

ity does not consist in sandals and sun-baths, but mainly in getting one's mind cleared of cant.

. . . . . .

The Money Power and the Mob are correlative terms; they produce each other. Money rules because men are for sale; and they are for sale because they need the money. The eternal pull and haul between plutocracy and proletarianism leads no whither, unless to general pessimism, neuroticism, and imbecility.

What the situation demands is a mutuality of those who are not in the market either to buy brains or to sell them; men who are deadly sick of all the variegated kinds of shuffling and lying, who cannot and will not deny themselves the luxury of free breathing and the joy of being unmuffled and disengaged, who are determined to play at their work, and not to work at anything they cannot play at, and play fair. Such a combination of Round Heads, Beggars of Flanders, Gray Friars, Little Brothers of Humility — are the Fellows of the University Militant. If you cannot grasp the idea, you are not called or chosen.

FOR A UNIVERSITY QUADRANGLE

SEVERAL attempts have been made to house the Municipal University, but the motion in that line has been slow. In December, 1905, a small sum, a thousand dollars, was subscribed toward this project, but the matter was postponed. Two months ago a contract was made for the purchase of the fifty-foot lot immediately north of All Souls' Church; and plans were sketched by Mr. Siemans, of the firm of Root & Siemans, architects. But, after some weeks of negotiation, it turned out that the lot could not be conveyed without such restrictions as would utterly spoil the building plan. So the contract was cancelled.

Mr. Siemans' plan contemplated an inner court or patio, seventy feet long by half as many wide, with a pool, spaces for huge flower-pots, a little grass, and vines, and some stone-seats fit for the groves of Academia — the kind of seats that figure in the compositions of Alma-Tadema. This little quadrangle was to be enclosed on the east and west by two stone and half-timbered buildings, each thirty by fifty feet on the ground and two stories high; on the north by an open gallery or cloister, and on the south by the stone wall

of the church. The ground floors were to be used for club-rooms, including a cuisine, and the upper floors for lodging — reserved for men who should hold some such relation to the institution that the "residents" do to a college settlement. The rentals they would pay would go half way toward supporting the whole affair.

These ideas remain to be carried out elsewhere, probably on a site nearer the heart of the city.

NOTES

Mr. Walsh's article on "The Work of a Citizens' Lobby" is offered as evidence of the extraordinary power that can be exercised over legislation by a little group of plain citizens who take time to inform themselves and concert their action, and who really have no private axe to grind. This new-fashioned lobby was made up mainly of men whose names are on the roll of the Municipal University, but the movement was purely spontaneous and unofficial. Nobody pretended to represent anything but human nature and himself. The meetings of the lobby were held regularly on Sunday afternoons in the vestry-room of St. Paul's Church, where the chairs were comfortable and the cigars were good; and were continued through most of the time that the Legislature was in session at Jefferson City. Every bill that the lobby proposed to deal with was canvassed at these meetings and then turned over to a special committee. Week by week several members of the company made a sojourn at Jefferson City — spending their time and their money in so quixotic a manner that the bills were passed while their opponents were groping blindly for their motives.

The tenement-house problem is a liberal education in sociology. It cuts deep. Probably the

ultimate solutions cannot be reached short of a clear understanding that civilization requires the establishment of a minimum standard of living. Nobody has a right to live squalidly — not in a city. He ought to be compelled to go into the woods to do it. A mean and unhealthy house should be illegal. Hitherto, municipal reformers have never thought to do more than mitigate the misery of slums. This is a mistake. The medication of nuisances is too complicated a process. It 's easier to abolish them.

But how shall poor people pay rent for good houses? How? Why not abolish the poor people too? If they lived in decent houses, they would n't *be* poor. They would insist upon holding their heads up — as well-lodged horses do.

But while civilization in general is yawning toward a wake-up, there are various things in the line of making good houses cheap that individuals can do. The men of the Municipal University who have looked into this matter — they have given a good deal of time to it — are clear that comfortable low-grade apartments can be provided at from twenty-five to fifty percent less than the ruling prices — and pay dividends of four or five per cent on the investment. Some months ago they sent a circular letter to a thousand people in Kansas City inviting co-operation in this kind of an enterprise. There was very little response to this sally, though the Municipal Tenement-House Commission, appointed by the Mayor supported the project and approved it by formal resolution.

A committee from the Municipal University

stands ready to give its services to the community in the organizing of a building company on the lines suggested above.

The University of the People is not to be thought of as a compact organization framed to perform a succession of public feats. It is rather a fluent and spiritual order, an invisible church, a conspiracy of those who find satisfaction in putting a touch of dare-devil and romance to their every-day business. The association forms swiftly, for this purpose or for that, dissolves into thin air, and then takes shape again. Mostly it is anonymous — and does not let its right hand know. But it makes no point of anonymity; it elects officers and takes a postoffice address — for certain practical purposes. There are no dignitaries. As eight hundred years ago in the Italian city of Bologna, an unknown man, a student, no scholar — he happened to be a youth of scarcely twenty-one — was made Rector or President of the University, to serve as a mere symbol of the republicanism of letters — so now it is in Kansas City. The offices are not honorific.

The Truth is not in majorities; but does it not lie at the point where two men of opposite prejudices meet? And if it is a sound principle that the truth is elicited by the cancellation of partialities, is there not hope of an association such as this? It includes "practical politicians," men who are always consulted by the party managers of both parties in this State; it includes a man who

has been at the head of the Employers' Association here and another who was for years the chief of the labor organizations in Kansas City. There are lawyers and gospellers, Trojans and Tyrians, Jews, Turks and Infidels. Shade of Gotthold Lessing! Is there not stuff here for a dramatic poem — a new "Nathan the Wise" and parable of the three rings?

The federation of the world is supposed to be a problem in international diplomacy. This is a mistake. It is a domestic, a municipal problem. As General Hancock said of the tariff, with more wit than was appreciated: "It is a local issue."

In 1861 William H. Seward, Lincoln's Secretary of State, deliberately planned to bring on a war with Great Britain in order to draw the North and South together against a common enemy. Seward was a good statescraftsman; he knew his trade. Under modern economic conditions every country in Europe, America, and the newly aroused Orient tends constantly and more or less rapidly toward civil war — toward a violent rupture between the debtor and the creditor class. Whenever the strain approaches the breaking-point, sound statesmanship prescribes a foreign war. It is the only specific that sound statesmanship of the traditionary kind knows of — for restoring the fainting sense of social solidarity — *i. e.*, commercial credit.

Such has been the origin of all the international wars of the last century — plainly of the Russo-Japanese war, on both sides; of the Boer war, on

the British side; of the Spanish-American war, on the side of Spain at least — and so on, back to the Napoleonic wars.

The gains of the Hague Congresses are mostly illusory. The international questions are mere distorted phases of the social questions. A peace conference in Kansas City in which the Commercial Club should establish a permanent human understanding with the Industrial Council of the local trade-unions would have greater historical consequences than anything that lies within the possibilities of the distinguished company at the Dutch Capital. When the social contradiction reaches its solution in a single American city, we shall sight the terminal of international war. For every neighboring municipality will be compelled to rise to the new standard of civilization; since no city languishing under the immense frictional loss of the class struggle can compete for a single year with one that has eliminated that waste. And when the whole country has thus mobilized its creative forces, it can impose peace upon the world.

War is at bottom a business enterprise. The gist of military power lies in the command of the wheat-fields and the shops. The soldier shoots and the commissary does the rest. It follows that when this country shall have acquired an incomparable economic advantage over its neighbors — which it has not yet, in spite of vulgar boasts — it will make its good counsels mandatory and irresistible in the cabinets of Europe and Asia.

To-day Japan is being driven into war by the economic tension in its home affairs. It is mainly an agricultural country; and it supports its pomp of empire on an area of arable land slightly larger than that of a circle having Kansas City as a centre with a radius reaching to St. Joseph — a radius say, for good measure, of seventy-five miles. Its public debt is out of all proportion even to the debts of the sweating European peoples. Japan must expand, or explode — unless, indeed, it shall hear the gospel of the university, and precede this country in repentance.

The Union Station problem brings us face to face with the insoluble contradiction between public and private business. There is absolutely no reasonable solution of the problem in the shape in which it is posed. The negotiation drags so interminably because of the abnormality, the monstrosity of the general proposition — that a civic corporation should deliberately bargain to give its gates for a thousand years — or fifty — into the keeping of another corporation having wholly adverse interests!

The two corporations — the Municipality and the Terminal Company — are constructed on opposite plans; one is as foreign to the other as St. Petersburg to Pekin. The Municipal corporation is so constituted that its officers can look for promotion and a career if they succeed in lowering the costs of transportation; but the officers of the Terminal Company can advance their fortunes only in the opposite direction.

Here is the whole problem of the trusts, the problem of corporate monopoly in a nut-shell. The true statement of the problem is: How shall we reorganize the private corporations so that they shall become public, in the sense that their officers shall have the same motive that the officers of a city have — the same chance to grow by serving civilization?

All the tedious and sordid governmental devices for tricking the corporation-managers with spies or scaring them with penalties will pass as a haggard dream. Men, on the average, are very human — and much alike. The difference between the counsel of the Terminal Company, and the city counsellor, is not personal, but institutional. The excellent lawyer for the Terminal Company happens to have implicated his fortunes in an institutional type that is hastening to become as Nineveh and Tyre.

The self-contained private business corporation built to make money for its stockholders, by any means short of a head-end collision with public law — is obsolescent. It is not guessing much to say that in the "public service" corporation of the near future the following considerations will be worked out:

(1) The stockholders will cease to be owners and will come to be considered merely as preferred creditors; the managers will be regarded as agents of the public.

(2) There will be a maximum-salary scale and a minimum-wage scale.

(3) The public authority will limit interest and

dividends at a rate just high enough to fetch the required capital; and then will regulate the service-charges to match.

THE WORK OF A CITIZENS' LOBBY

FRANK P. WALSH

THE last General Assembly passed more radical legislation than any that has ever convened since Missouri became a State. The railroad and public utility corporations of the State maintained a most active and aggressive lobby during both the regular and special sessions. The men composing this lobby were surprised and horrified to find a few well-posted and active men in charge of every proposed law affecting the general welfare of the people. These men, comprising a sort of "people's lobby," were on hand at every committee meeting prepared to argue the merits of the proposed measure, to submit legal authorities as to its constitutionality and to assist in every way by statistics and legislative history of other States to guide the legislators aright.

The fight for the passage of what was known as the Enabling Act was the liveliest contest of the session. It was defeated by the manœuvring of the corporation lobby in the regular session, but was submitted by Governor Folk in his call for a special session — and passed. This bill gives the absolute authority to the municipalities of the State to fix rates for the service of all public utilities within their corporate limits and to provide

and enforce fines and penalties to make the legislation effective.

Our new public-utility law is the most far-reaching and comprehensive law of this character passed by any State in the Union. The corporations' lobby first attempted to defeat the law and finally offered as a compromise the State Commission Law lately recommended by Governor Hughes and passed by the New York Legislature.

Among other laws of great public advantage passed by the State Legislature may be mentioned the following:

1. Reducing passenger rates upon all railroads over forty-five miles in length to two cents.

2. The Maximum Freight Rate Law, which, if it be permitted to be enforced by Federal Judge McPherson, will save millions of dollars annually to the producers and consumers of the State.

3. A comprehensive and effective law prohibiting child labor.

4. An amendment to the State Constitution providing for initiative and referendum.

This latter law gives the people the right to initiate legislation upon a petition setting forth the proposed law and signed by eight per cent of the voters of at least two thirds of the congressional districts of the State. It also gives to the people the power to have all laws (except those for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety and laws making appropriations for current expenses of the State Government, for the maintenance of the State institutions, and

for the support of public schools) referred to the people for ratification or rejection, and abolishes the veto power of the Governor as to all measures so referred directly to the people.

5. Giving the jury in capital punishment cases the option to inflict either the death penalty or imprisonment for life in the penitentiary.

The practical effect of this law will be to abolish capital punishment, that relic of the dark ages.

6. Providing for forfeiture of the charter of any railroad or insurance company that shall remove a case to the Federal Court.

7. Prohibiting the railroad companies from permitting telegraph operators and train dispatchers to work for more than eight consecutive hours in twenty-four.

Many of the deplorable casualities upon railroads have been caused by the long hours which railroad companies have compelled this class of their employees to work.

8. A general state primary law. This law provides for nomination by all political parties for the state and county offices throughout the entire State upon the same day, with the same number of polling-places, and with the same penalties for illegal practices as in case of a general election.

9. Extending the power of the factory inspectors and increasing the number of assistants. This law ought to go far towards protecting the lives and limbs of persons working in the great industrial centres of the State.

10. Granting railroad commissioners the power to fix railroad rates and providing that all orders

so made shall be effective until overruled by a court of competent jurisdiction.

11. To strengthen the Anti-Trust Law by providing that violations thereof shall be punished by imprisonment as well as by fines.

12. Making mine operators and owners responsible to their servants for injuries caused by the negligence of fellow-servants.

13. Increasing the amount of liability in all cases for deaths by negligence from five thousand to ten thousand dollars.

14. Providing that the right of action for personal injury shall survive the death of the injured person.

15. Requiring switches and guard-rails to be blocked for the safety of railroad employees.

16. Compelling railroad companies to equip their engines, cars and trains with safety appliances.

The men who represented the side of the people in the passage of these new laws were, as usual, denounced by the corporation lobby as dreamers, socialists, cranks, kickers, etc., but they pursued their work with cheerful enthusiasm that cared not for difficulties or criticism.

Much aid was given the passage of these laws by incorporating pledges for their enactment in the last Democratic State platform, thus making them in a sense party measures of the dominant party.

Governor Folk also included them in his message at the opening of the Legislature, and strongly urged their passage.

378 .F352
The university militant,
Stanford University Libraries
3 6105 042 832 803